

	22	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.00
		Government tax on cheques	.26
	29	Bank exchange	.22
Dec.	7	T. N. Metcalf, track rules committee	18.38
	12	Sportsmanship Brotherhood, dues	10.00
		American Olympic Association, dues	400.00
	13	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams	2.90
	15	Wesleyan University, addressing	1.00
		C. L. Brewer, vice-president's expenses	14.50
	20	Bank exchange	.10
	27	Amount carried forward	5,038.95
			\$11,652.00

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL
CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COL-
LEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,
DECEMBER 27-28, 1935

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Association - - - - -	2
Rules Committees for 1936 - - - - -	3
Roll of Members - - - - -	6
Delegates and Visitors present - - - - -	13
Proceedings of Convention of 1935 - - - - -	16
Reports of Districts - - - - -	21
Reports of Rules Committees:	
Association Football (Soccer) - - - - -	39
Basketball - - - - -	40
Boxing - - - - -	42
Fencing - - - - -	44
Football - - - - -	44
Gymnastics - - - - -	48
Ice Hockey - - - - -	48
Lacrosse - - - - -	49
Swimming - - - - -	50
Track and Field - - - - -	55
Wrestling - - - - -	55
Reports of Special Committees:	
Federal Admissions Tax - - - - -	60
Addresses at the Convention:	
Presidential Address—John L. Griffith - - - - -	61
Joseph E. Raycroft - - - - -	68
General Palmer E. Pierce - - - - -	77
C. L. Brewer - - - - -	81
W. E. Forsyth - - - - -	81
B. W. Bierman - - - - -	83
Report of Round Table Conference - - - - -	85
Report of Treasurer for 1935 - - - - -	114

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1936

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Brigadier General Palmer E. Pierce, Room 1616, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Professor Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

PRESIDENT

Major J. L. Griffith, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

Professor Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

COUNCIL

(In addition to the President and Secretary the following vice-presidents, *ex officio*.)

First District, Mr. Malcolm Farmer, Yale University.
Second District, Professor H. Diederichs, Cornell University.
Third District, Professor W. C. Smith, Tulane University.
Fourth District, Professor R. W. Aigler, University of Michigan.
Fifth District, Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College.
Sixth District, Professor E. W. McDiarmid, Texas Christian University.
Seventh District, Dr. A. C. Nelson, University of Denver.
Eighth District, Professor H. C. Willett, University of Southern California.

Members at Large*

Mr. Romeyn Berry, Cornell University.
Professor C. L. Brewer, University of Missouri.
Director R. A. Fetzer, University of North Carolina.
Professor H. J. McIntyre, University of Washington.
Dean E. L. Mercer, University of Pennsylvania.
Professor W. E. Metzenthin, University of Texas.
Professor L. W. St. John, Ohio State University.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The president and secretary, *ex officio*
Professor P. O. Badger Mr. Romeyn Berry Director W. J. Bingham
Dean E. L. Mercer Dr. J. E. Raycroft Dean R. L. Sackett
Professor L. W. St. John

* Elected by the Council.

RULES COMMITTEES FOR 1936

For football, basketball, and track rules the figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 before the name of a member of a committee indicate that the individual in question is to serve one, two, three, or four years, beginning this year.

Association Football Rules

H. W. Clark, Lafayette College, Chairman; Burnham M. Dell, Princeton University; A. W. Marsh, Amherst College; Douglas Stewart, University of Pennsylvania.

Advisory Committee: Robert Dunn, Swarthmore College; N. M. Fleming, Penn. State College; James Gentle, Haverford College; H. W. Maloney, Stanford University; C. S. Moll, Kansas State College; S. C. Staley, University of Illinois.

Basketball Rules

L. W. St. John, Ohio State University, Chairman; Oswald Tower, Andover Academy, Editor; James A. Naismith, University of Kansas (Life Member); (1) W. McK. Barber, 1st district; Forrest C. Allen, 5th district; (2) Henry Crisp, 3rd district; James St. Clair, 6th district; (3) W. E. Meanwell, 4th district; Willard Witte, 7th district; (4) H. H. Salmon, Jr., 2nd district; John Bunn, 8th district.

Boxing Rules

Hugo Bezdek, Penn. State College, Chairman; Wm. H. Cowell, University of New Hampshire; James G. Driver, University of Virginia; Capt. R. C. Giffen, U. S. Naval Academy; I. F. Toomey, University of California at Davis; Capt. Thomas M. Watlington, U. S. Military Academy.

Fencing Rules

Hugh V. Alessandrini, Columbia University, Chairman; George H. Breed, Harvard University; John H. Hanway, Yale University; Joseph Levis, Mass. Institute of Technology; Harold Van Buskirk, University of Pennsylvania.

Football Rules

Walter Okeson, Lehigh University, Chairman; W. S. Langford, New York City, Secretary; A. A. Stagg, College of Pacific (Life Member); (1) H. J. Stegeman, 3rd district; F. H. Yost, 4th district; (2) W. O. Hunter, 8th district; Morley Jennings, 6th district; (3) W. G. Crowell, 2nd district; L. Mahoney, 7th district; (4) W. J. Bingham, 1st district; D. X. Bible, 5th district.

Gymnastic Rules

Christopher A. Beling, Newark, N. J., Chairman; John A. Davis, Stevens Institute of Technology; C. W. Graydon, Flushing, N. Y.; D. L. Hoffer, University of Chicago.

Advisory Committee: Fred W. Ball, Princeton University; Harry Maloney, Stanford University; Ray Moore, New York University; E. G. Schroeder, University of Iowa; Claude Simons, Tulane University.

Ice Hockey Rules

Albert I. Prettyman, Hamilton College, Chairman; J. O. Bulkley, Yale University; Louis F. Keller, University of Minnesota; J. Edward Lowery, University of Michigan; Joseph Stubbs, Harvard University.

Advisory Committee: Arnold Eddy, University of Southern California; Gerard Hallock, III, Princeton University; Lieut. E. S. Molitor, U. S. Military Academy; L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College; Donald D. Sands, Boston, Mass.; Rev. F. H. Sill, O.H.C., Kent School; A. G. Smith, President Eastern Hockey Officials Association.

Lacrosse Rules

R. D. Root, Yale University, Chairman; John Faber, University of Maryland; Kenneth Fairman, Princeton University; L. J. Korn, Swarthmore College; H. J. Rockafeller, Rutgers College; Roy Simons, Syracuse University.

Advisory Committee: J. B. Crenshaw, Georgia School of Technology; T. B. Davies, Colorado College; L. B. Johnston, Dartmouth College.

Swimming Rules

F. W. Luehring, University of Pennsylvania, Chairman; A. E. Eilers, Washington University; C. E. Forsythe, High School

Federation; Edward T. Kennedy, Columbia University; R. J. H. Kiphuth, Yale University; Niels Thorpe, University of Minnesota.

Advisory Committee: C. J. Alderson, University of Texas; David Armbruster, University of Iowa; A. H. Armstrong, Georgia School of Technology; Ernst Brandsten, Stanford University; Fred Cady, University of Southern California; Ray Daughters, University of Washington; Radford McCormick, College of the City of New York; R. B. Miller, Bowdoin College; Mike Peppe, Ohio State University; G. W. Scott, Colorado School of Mines.

Track Rules

T. N. Metcalf, University of Chicago, Chairman; (1) Clyde Littlefield, 6th district; Harry Hillman, 1st district; (2) R. A. Fetzer, 3rd district; H. W. Hughes, 7th district; (3) K. L. Wilson, 4th district; Lawson Robertson, 2nd district; (4) Franklin P. Johnson, 5th district; Brutus Hamilton, 8th district.

Wrestling Rules

R. G. Clapp, University of Nebraska, Chairman; C. F. Foster, Princeton University; C. P. Miles, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; Dr. J. A. Rockwell, Mass. Institute of Technology; E. G. Schroeder, University of Iowa; D. B. Swingle, Montana State College; P. E. Wiggins, High School Federation.

Advisory Committee: Walter Franklin, University of Colorado; C. J. Gallagher, Harvard University; E. C. Gallagher, Oklahoma A. & M. College; J. Hancock, Colorado Teachers College; R. J. McLean, University of Texas; Hugo Otopolik, Iowa State College; Maj. H. M. Reed, Virginia Military Institute; Wm. Sheridan, Lehigh University; H. A. Stone, University of California.

ROLL OF MEMBERS

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

First District

Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., Stanley King, LL.D., President.
 Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, Clifton D. Gray, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Boston College, Boston, Mass., Rev. Louis J. Gallagher, Ph.D., President.
 Boston University, Boston, Mass., Daniel L. Marsh, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., President.
 Brown University, Providence, R. I., Clarence A. Barbour, S.T.D., LL.D., President.
 Connecticut State College, Storrs, Conn., Albert M. Jorgenson, President.
 Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., Ernest M. Hopkins, LL.D., President.
 Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., James B. Conant, Ph.D., President.
 International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass., L. L. Doggett, Ph.D., President.
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., Karl T. Compton, Sc.D., President.
 Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass., Hugh P. Baker, M.F., President.
 Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., Paul Dwight Moody, D.D., President.
 Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., Porter H. Adams, M.S., President.
 Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I., Raymond G. Bressler, M.S., President.
 Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., Rev. Remsen B. Ogilby, LL.D., President.
 Tufts College, Medford, Mass., John A. Cousens, LL.D., President.
 United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., Capt. E. D. Jones, U. S. C. G., Superintendent.
 University of Maine, Orono, Me., Arthur A. Hauck, Ph.D., President.
 University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., Edward M. Lewis, LL.D., President.
 University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., Guy W. Bailey, LL.D., President.
 Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., James L. McConaughy, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Tyler Dennett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass., Captain Ralph Earle, U.S.N., President.
 Yale University, New Haven, Conn., James Rowland Angell, Litt.D., President.

Second District

Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y., J. Nelson Norwood, Ph.D., President.
 Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., William P. Tolley, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Harry S. Rogers, Sc.D., President.
 Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa., Charles Watkins, Ph.D., Acting president.
 Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y., James Shelby Thomas, M.A., President.

Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., George B. Cutten, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President.
 College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y., Frederick B. Robinson, Ph.D., President.
 Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., Livingston Farrand, M.D., LL.D., President.
 Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Pa., Parke R. Kolbe, Ph.D., President.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., Fred P. Corson, D.D., President.
 Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., Rev. J. J. Callahan, LL.D., President.
 Fordham University, New York, N. Y., Rev. A. J. Hogan, Ph.D., President.
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Henry H. Apple, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., McLeod M. Pearce, D.D., President.
 Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., Henry W. A. Hanson, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., Frederick C. Ferry, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., W. W. Comfort, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.
 Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., Murray Bartlett, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., William M. Lewis, LL.D., President.
 Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Clarence C. Williams, President.
 Manhattan College, New York, N. Y., Brother Patrick, President.
 New York University, New York, N. Y., Harry W. Chase, Ph.D., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N. Y., Joseph M. Noonan, S.T.D., President.
 Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., Frank K. Hyatt, LL.D., President.
 Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., Ralph D. Hetzel, LL.D., Litt.D., President.
 Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., Harold W. Dodds, Ph.D., President.
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., William O. Hotchkiss, Ph.D., President.
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., Robert C. Clothier, LL.D., President.
 St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y., Laurens H. Seelye, President.
 State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa., Norman W. Cameron, Ph.D., President.
 Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., H. N. Davis, Ph.D., President.
 Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa., Rev. G. Morris Smith, D.D., President.
 Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Frank Aydelotte, LL.D., D.Litt., President.
 Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Charles W. Flint, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., Charles E. Beury, LL.B., President.
 Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., Dixon R. Fox, Ph.D., President.
 United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Major General W. D. Connor, U.S.A., Superintendent.
 University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., Samuel P. Capen, Ph.D., President.
 University of Delaware, Newark, Del., Walter Hüllihen, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., President.
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Thomas S. Gates, LL.D., President.

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., John G. Bowman, LL.D., Chancellor.
 University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Alan C. Valentine, LL.D.,
 Villanova College, Villanova, Pa., Rev. E. V. Stanford, LL.D., President.
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., Charles S. Boucher, Ph.D., President.

Third District

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., Luther N. Duncan, LL.D., President.
 Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., Right Rev. James H. Ryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Centenary College, Shreveport, La., Pierce Cline, M.A., President.
 Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C., Enoch W. Sikes, Ph.D., President.
 Duke University, Durham, N. C., William P. Few, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., Rev. W. C. Nevils, Ph.D., President.
 Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., Marion L. Brittain, LL.D., President.
 Howard University, Washington, D. C., Mordecai W. Johnson, D.D., President.
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., Isaiah Bowman, Sc.D., President.
 Loyola University, New Orleans, La., J. W. Hynes, S.J., D.D., President.
 Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., Monsignor B. J. Bradley, LL.D., President.
 Tulane University, New Orleans, La., A. B. Dinwiddie, LL.D., President.
 United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Rear Admiral D. F. Sellers, U.S.N., Superintendent.
 University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., B. Herbert Brown, Jr., LL.B., Vice-president.
 University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., John J. Tigert, D.C.L., LL.D., President.
 University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., S. V. Sanford, Litt.D., President.
 University of Maryland, College Park, Md., H. C. Byrd, Acting president.
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Frank P. Graham, LL.D., D.C.L., President.
 University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., Benjamin F. Finney, LL.D., President.
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., James D. Hoskins, LL.B., President.
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., John L. Newcomb, B.A., C.E., President.
 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., Francis P. Gaines, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.

Fourth District

Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill., Frederic R. Hamilton, Ph.D., President.
 Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind., James W. Putnam, Ph.D., President.
 Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., Donald J. Cowling, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, William E. Wickenden, Sc.D., President.

Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Avery A. Shaw, D.D., President.
 DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., G. Bromley Oxnam, D.D., President.
 Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., William L. Bryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., Albert Britt, Litt.D., President.
 Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., Henry M. Wriston, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., William M. Magee, S.J., LL.D., President.
 Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Alfred H. Upham, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., Robert S. Shaw, B.S.A., President.
 Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich., Charles McKenny, LL.D., President.
 Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Walter D. Scott, Ph.D., President.
 Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Ernest H. Wilkins, Ph.D., President.
 Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, George W. Rightmire, M.A., President.
 Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, Edwin W. Chubb, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
 Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Edmund D. Soper, D.D., President.
 Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., Edward C. Elliott, Ph.D., President.
 University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, Hezzelton E. Simmons, M.S., President.
 University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Robert M. Hutchins, LL.D., President.
 University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, Raymond Walters, M.A., President.
 University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., Albert H. Poetker, LL.D., President.
 University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., Arthur C. Willard, LL.D., President.
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., Alexander G. Ruthven, Ph.D., President.
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Lotus D. Coffman, Ph.D., President.
 University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., Rev. J. F. O'Hara, C.S.C., President.
 University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Glenn Frank, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
 Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich., Dwight B. Waldo, LL.D., President.
 Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio, Charles F. Wishart, D.D., President.

Fifth District

Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Harry M. Gage, LL.D., President.
 Creighton University, Omaha, Neb., Rev. P. J. Mahan, LL.D., President.
 Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, Daniel W. Morehouse, Ph.D., President.
 Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, John S. Nollen, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Raymond M. Hughes, LL.D., President.
 Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., F. D. Farrell, Agr.D., President.
 Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Okla., Henry G. Bennett, Ph.D., President.
 St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., Robert S. Johnston, S.J., S.T.D., President.

State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, Eugene A. Gilmore, LL.D., President.
 University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., Ernest H. Lindley, Ph.D., Chancellor.
 University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Walter Williams, LL.D., President.
 University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., Edgar A. Burnett, Sc.D., Chancellor.
 University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla., Clarence I. Pontius, B.S., President.
 University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans., William M. Jardine, LL.D., President.
 Washburn College, Topeka, Kans., Philip C. King, D.D., President.
 Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., G. R. Throop, Ph.D., Chancellor.

Sixth District

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, Pat M. Neff, LL.D., President.
 Rice Institute, Houston, Texas, Edgar O. Lovett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, C. C. Selecman, D.D., President.
 Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Station, Texas, Thomas O. Walton, LL.D., President.
 University of Texas, Austin, Texas, H. Y. Benedict, Ph.D., LL.D., President.

Seventh District

Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Col., Charles A. Lory, LL.D., Sc.D., President.
 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., George Norlin, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, George Thomas, Ph.D., President.

Eighth District

Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore., G. W. Peavy, President.
 Stanford University, Stanford University, Cal., Ray Lyman Wilbur, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash., Ernest O. Holland, Ph.D., President.
 University of California, Berkeley, Cal., Robert G. Sproul, LL.D., President.
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore., C. Valentine Boyer, Ph.D., President.
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., R. B. von Kleinsmid, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., Lee Paul Sieg, Ph.D., President.

ALLIED MEMBERS

Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia	Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg
Fort Hays Kansas State College	Municipal University of Wichita
	Southwestern College

Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Bluefield State Teachers College	St. Augustine's College
Hampton Institute	St. Paul Normal and Industrial School
Howard University	Shaw University
Lincoln University	Johnson C. Smith University
Morgan College	Virginia State College
North Carolina A. & T. College	Virginia Union University
North Carolina State College	

Kansas College Athletic Association, comprising:

Bethany College	Ottawa University
St. Mary's College	McPherson College
Baker University	Kansas Wesleyan University

Middle Atlantic States College Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bucknell University	Muhlenberg College
Columbia University	New York University
University of Delaware	University of Pennsylvania
Drexel Institute	Pennsylvania Military College
Franklin and Marshall College	Princeton University
Gettysburg College	Rutgers University
Haverford College	Stevens Institute
Johns Hopkins University	Susquehanna University
Juniata College	Ursinus College
Lebanon Valley College	Washington College
Lehigh University	

Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Beloit College	Knox College
Carleton College	Lawrence College
Coe College	Monmouth College
Cornell College	Ripon College

Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Iowa State College	University of Missouri
Kansas State Agricultural College	University of Nebraska
University of Kansas	University of Oklahoma

Missouri Valley Conference, comprising:

Creighton University	Tulsa University
Drake University	Washburn College
Grinnell College	Washington University
Oklahoma A. & M. College	

Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Oregon Agricultural College	University of Oregon
Stanford University	University of Southern California
State College of Washington	University of Washington
State University of Montana	University of California, at Los Angeles
University of California	
University of Idaho	

Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference, comprising:

University of Colorado	Utah Agricultural College
Colorado State School of Mines	Colorado Agricultural College
Colorado College	Colorado State Teachers College
University of Denver	Western State Teachers College
Brigham Young University	Montana State College
University of Utah	University of Wyoming

Southern Conference, comprising:

Clemson College	University of South Carolina
Duke University	University of Virginia
University of Maryland	Virginia Military Institute
North Carolina State College	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of North Carolina	Washington and Lee University

Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Morehouse College	Clark University
Morris Brown University	Florida A. & M. College
Alabama State Teachers College	Knoxville College
Talladega College	Fisk University
Tuskegee Institute	Le Moyne College
Benedict College	S. Carolina A. & M. College

Southeastern Conference, comprising:

University of Alabama	Mississippi A. & M. College
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	University of Mississippi
University of Florida	University of the South
Georgia School of Technology	University of Tennessee
University of Georgia	Tulane University
University of Kentucky	Vanderbilt University
Louisiana State University	

Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

California Institute of Technology	San Diego State Teachers College
Occidental College	University of Redlands
Pomona College	Whittier College
La Verne College	Santa Barbara State Teachers College

Southwest Athletic Conference, comprising:

Baylor University	Texas University
Rice Institute	University of Arkansas
Southern Methodist University	Texas Christian University
A. & M. College of Texas	

Southwestern Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bishop College	Langston University
Wiley College	Southern University
Texas College	Prairie View State Normal College
Samuel Houston College	

Western Conference, comprising:

University of Chicago	University of Minnesota
University of Illinois	Northwestern University
University of Indiana	Ohio State University
University of Iowa	Purdue University
University of Michigan	University of Wisconsin

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Andover Academy, Andover, Mass.
Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa.
Rochester Mechanics Institute, Rochester, N. Y.

LIST OF DELEGATES AND VISITORS AT THE THIRTIETH CONVENTION

I. MEMBER INSTITUTIONS:

Alabama Polytechnic Institute: W. H. Hutsell.
Alfred University: J. K. Cox, J. A. McLane.
Allegheny College: A. S. Daniels, H. P. Way.
Amherst College: L. Jordan, A. E. Lumley, A. W. Marsh, A. G. Wheeler.
Bates College: O. F. Cutts.
Boston College: J. P. Curley, R. F. Harrington.
Boston University: J. De Masi, J. M. Harmon, W. J. Marling.
Bowdoin College: J. J. Magee, R. B. Miller, M. E. Morrell, A. Walsh, L. S. Wells.
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute: A. C. Banks.
Brown University: S. T. Arnold, F. W. Marvel, L. E. Swain, T. W. Taylor.
Case School of Applied Science: C. L. Eddy.
Colgate University: J. L. Hart, J. F. Orsi, W. A. Reid, J. F. Rourke, J. H. Starr.
College of the City of New York: W. Williamson, F. A. Woll.
Columbia University: C. L. Brownell, W. L. Hughes.
Connecticut State College: J. O. Christian, R. J. Guyer, W. H. Kinsey.
Cornell University: R. Berry, J. Lynah, H. B. Ortner.
Dartmouth College: R. J. Delahanty, H. M. Evans.
Dickinson College: J. H. McCormick.
Drexel Institute: D. Dowell, W. J. Stevens.
Fordham University: J. F. Coffey.
Georgetown University: J. J. Kehoe, H. G. Murphy.
Gettysburg College: C. E. Bilheimer.
Hamilton College: A. I. Prettyman.
Harvard University: W. J. Bingham, H. W. Clark, A. W. Samborski.
Haverford College: A. Evans, A. W. Haddleton, H. T. Brown, Jr.
Hobart College: F. L. Kraus.
Howard University: J. H. Burr, C. W. Davis.
Indiana University: Z. G. Clevenger.
International Y. M. C. A. College: E. Berry, J. D. Brock, H. S. DeGroat, E. J. Hickox, L. J. Judd, J. L. Rothacher.
Iowa State College: J. E. Truskowski, G. F. Veenker.
Johns Hopkins University: G. W. Shaffer.
Kansas State College: M. F. Ahearn, W. H. Haylett.
Lafayette College: T. A. Distler, H. A. Lorenz.
Lehigh University: N. A. Kellogg, W. R. Okeson.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: R. T. Joep, J. A. Rockwell.
Massachusetts State College: M. H. Taube.
Miami University: M. A. Ditmer, G. L. Rider.
Michigan State College: C. W. Bachman, L. L. Frimodig, R. C. Huston, R. H. Young.
Middlebury College: B. H. Beck, A. M. Brown, W. J. Nelson.
New York University: P. O. Badger, J. Musser, F. P. Wall.
Niagara University: J. J. Gallagher.
Northwestern University: K. L. Wilson.
Oberlin College: D. Kinsey, W. R. Morrison, J. H. Nichols, C. W. Savage.
Ohio State University: T. E. French.

Ohio University: O. C. Bird, D. C. Peden.
 Pennsylvania Military College: J. Timm.
 Pennsylvania State College: H. Bezdek, R. L. Sackett.
 Princeton University: C. W. Kennedy, W. Logan, J. E. Raycroft.
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: H. A. Van Velsor.
 Rhode Island State College: F. D. Tootell.
 Rice Institute: H. A. Scott.
 Rutgers University: G. E. Little, H. J. Rockafeller, J. W. Tasker.
 St. Louis University: C. E. Muellerleile.
 Stanford University: J. C. Hinsey, T. A. Storey.
 State University of Iowa: C. M. Updegraff.
 Susquehanna University: A. A. Stagg, Jr.
 Swarthmore College: R. Dunn, C. C. Miller, S. C. Palmer.
 Syracuse University: R. Barbuti, L. A. Bryan, T. F. Keane.
 Temple University: E. R. Yeomans.
 Texas A. and M. College: H. H. Norton.
 Trinity College: J. C. Clarke, W. E. McCloud.
 Tufts College: C. K. Delano, W. S. Yeager.
 Tulane University: W. C. Smith.
 Union College: N. W. Nitchman, J. H. Wittner.
 U. S. Coast Guard Academy: J. S. Merriman, Jr.
 U. S. Military Academy: R. G. Alexander, C. L. Fenton, L. D. Worsham.
 U. S. Naval Academy: A. K. Snyder.
 University of Akron: H. H. Blair.
 University of Baltimore: B. H. Brown, Jr., R. McRobie.
 University of Chicago: T. N. Metcalf.
 University of Colorado: W. B. Franklin.
 University of Delaware: A. C. Bowdle, L. Clark, J. F. Daugherty.
 University of Georgia: H. J. Mehre, H. J. Stegeman.
 University of Maine: T. S. Curtis.
 University of Maryland: J. E. Faber, C. L. Mackert, G. F. Pollock.
 University of Michigan: R. W. Aigler.
 University of Missouri: C. L. Brewer, D. Faurot.
 University of New Hampshire: W. H. Cowell, H. C. Swasey.
 University of North Carolina: O. K. Cornwell, R. A. Fetzer.
 University of Pennsylvania: F. W. Luehring, R. T. McKenzie, E. L. Mercer, H. J. Swarts.
 University of Pittsburgh: J. Hagan, W. D. Harrison, C. Olson.
 University of Rochester: L. A. Alexander, W. Campbell, R. C. Larkins, M. D. Lawless.
 University of the South: G. M. Clark.
 University of Southern California: W. R. LaPorte, H. C. Willett.
 University of Texas: W. E. Metzenthin.
 University of Vermont: S. C. Abell, W. L. Gardner, A. T. Post, H. A. Prentice.
 University of Virginia: N. Pritchett.
 University of Washington: C. F. Frankland.
 University of Wisconsin: W. E. Meanwell.
 Vanderbilt University: L. C. Glenn.
 Villanova College: A. G. Severance.
 Washington University: A. E. Eilers, F. H. Ewerhardt.
 Washington and Lee University: F. Fletcher.
 Wesleyan University: J. Blott, E. Fauver, D. Lash, J. F. Martin, H. G. McCurdy, F. W. Nicolson.
 West Chester State Teachers College: G. Killinger.
 Western State Teachers College, M. J. Gary.
 Williams College: J. E. Bullock, W. C. Fowle, C. L. Graham, E. A. Locke, A. B. Sniveley.
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: P. R. Carpenter.
 Yale University: R. J. H. Kiphuth.

II. ALLIED MEMBERS:

Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association: J. L. Whitehead.
 Kansas College Athletic Conference: E. J. Cragoe.
 Middle Atlantic States College Athletic Conference: C. E. Bilheimer.
 Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference: R. W. Barker.
 Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association: H. H. King.
 Missouri Valley Conference: A. E. Eilers, H. Ewerhardt.
 Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: H. C. Willett.
 Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference: J. C. Fitterer.
 Southern Conference: F. Fletcher.
 Southwest Athletic Conference: E. W. McDiarmid, W. E. Metzenthin.
 Western Conference: J. L. Griffith, G. A. Works.

III. ASSOCIATE MEMBER:

Phillips Academy, Andover: O. Tower.

IV. NON-MEMBER INSTITUTIONS:

Brooklyn College: F. A. Oleson, R. J. O'Neil.
 Colby College: G. F. Loebs, W. Millett, E. C. Roundy.
 Lebanon Valley College: C. R. Gingrich.
 Louisiana State University: T. P. Heard.
 Marshall College: O. Gullickser, C. Henderson.
 Moravian College: W. P. Cushman.
 University of Alabama: E. J. Wlodyka.
 University of California at Davis: I. F. Toomey.
 University of Kentucky: C. A. Wymse.
 University of Richmond: G. F. Thistlethwaite.
 Upsala College: P. L. Woerner.
 Westchester College: B. J. Dupree.

V. INDIVIDUALS:

National Council, Y. M. C. A.: Dr. John Brown, Jr.
 Y. M. C. A.: Robert C. Cubbon.
 Dept. of Education, State of Maine: C. Harry Edwards.
 Mt. Hermon School: Axel B. Forslund.
 George T. Hepbron, New York City.
 Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union: Dr. A. S. Lamb.
 Payne Whitney Clinic, N. Y. Hospital: Harry E. Lawson.
 Aquinas Institute, Rochester, N. Y.: John F. Sullivan.

THIRTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION

NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 27-28, 1935

The Association met, together with the College Physical Education Association, the American Student Health Association, and the American Football Coaches Association, in the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City.

1935 COUNCIL MEETING

An important and very interesting meeting was held on Thursday evening, December 26, at which a representative group dined together, and discussed matters of mutual interest for five hours. About 35 were present, including the President and the Secretary-Treasurer; vice-presidents of five of the eight districts, namely, Dean R. L. Sackett, 2nd District, representing also the Pennsylvania College Athletic Conference, Dr. W. C. Smith, 3rd District, representing also the Southeastern Conference, Professor C. L. Eddy, 4th District, representing also the Ohio Conference, Professor H. H. King, 5th District, representing also the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, Professor J. C. Fitterer, 7th District, representing also the Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference, and Professor H. C. Willett, 8th District, representing also the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; members at large of the Council, Mr. Romeyn Berry, Director W. J. Bingham, Director R. A. Fetzer, representing also the Southern Conference, Dean E. L. Mercer, and Dr. J. E. Raycroft; Professor P. O. Badger, member of the Executive Committee of the Association; representatives of a number of other conferences, namely, E. J. Cragoe, Kansas College Conference, C. E. Bilheimer, Middle Atlantic States Conference, F. H. Ewerhardt and A. E. Eilers, Missouri Valley Conference, W. E. Metzenthin, Southwestern Conference, and G. A. Works, Western Conference; chairmen of various rules committees, H. H. Salmon, Jr., basketball (in the absence of L. W. St. John, chairman), Hugo Bezdek, boxing, H. V. Alessandroni, fencing, W. R. Okeson, football, A. I. Prettyman, ice hockey, H. W. Clark, soccer football, F. W. Luehring, swimming, and T. N. Metcalf, track. W. E. Meanwell, University of Wisconsin, reported on plans for selecting the American Olympic basketball team, and C. M. Updegraff, University of Iowa, discussed the present status of broadcasting football games from

the colleges, and the financial arrangements involved. Mr. R. B. Miller, Bowdoin College, raised the question of a closer cooperation between the N. C. A. A. and the Swimming Coaches Association, and also suggested the desirability of the N. C. A. A. sponsoring an annual golf championship meet for the colleges of the country. The Council were delighted to listen to a former president of the N. C. A. A., Professor Charles W. Kennedy, of Princeton, who expressed his pleasure at the continued growth and influence of the organization. Others present were Professor Thomas E. French, Ohio State University, chairman of the committee to nominate rules committees, Professor W. R. LaPorte, University of Southern California, and Professor C. L. Brewer, University of Missouri.

ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

The topic of the Round Table Conference this year was "The Relation of Physical and Health Activities to the Academic Program." The leader of the Conference was Dean E. L. Mercer, University of Pennsylvania. Dr. R. Tait McKenzie, of the same university, read a brief paper giving his views of the subject, the outcome of many years of experience. An interesting discussion followed, which is reported *verbatim* in the Appendix, pages 85-105.

JOINT SESSION

The four organizations met in joint session on Friday afternoon, the presiding officer being Professor C. L. Brewer, University of Missouri, President of the Physical Education Association. The chief paper was by Dr. Joseph E. Raycroft, Princeton University, with the title: "Origins and Relationships of Athletics, Physical Education, and Medical Service in American Colleges." With his long and intimate association with all four of the organizations at the combined meeting, Dr. Raycroft was well qualified to give an historical account of the foundation of each of them, and to point out many phases of inter-activity. The paper is printed on pages 68-76 of these Proceedings.

General Palmer E. Pierce, Honorary President of the N. C. A. A., contributed a valuable account of the organization of the N. C. A. A., the thirtieth anniversary of which is celebrated this year. General Pierce's paper will be found on pages 77-80. The presiding officer spoke briefly of the work of the Physical Education Association, and the presidents of the Student Health Association and the Football Coaches Association each gave a brief sketch of their organizations, describing their aims and methods of work. These addresses are printed on pages 81-84.

BUSINESS SESSION

The annual business meeting was held on Saturday morning at 10 o'clock, with President Griffith in the chair.

The presidential address is printed on pages 61-67.

In accordance with recommendations from the Executive Committee it was voted:

(1) To elect to membership Drexel Institute, Niagara University, and the University of Baltimore, and to allied membership the Southwestern Athletic Conference.

(2) That the N. C. A. A. Wrestling Meet be held at Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., March 20-21, 1936, and the Swimming Meet at Yale University, New Haven, Conn., March 27-28, 1936.

(3) That the president appoint a committee of three to consider, and report at the next Convention on, the desirability of the organization by the N. C. A. A. of a National Collegiate Golf Championship Meet.

(4) To invite the Track Coaches and the Swimming Coaches Associations to join the joint session of athletic organizations next year.

(5) To suggest to the colleges that they conduct water carnivals during the coming season, in order to raise funds for the expenses of the Olympic Men's Swimming Team.

The president announced the appointment of the following committee to consider and report on the subject of radio broadcasting of college football games: Professor C. M. Updegraff, University of Iowa, chairman, Professor H. C. Willett, University of Southern California, and Director R. A. Fetzer, University of North Carolina.

The treasurer presented his annual report, showing a balance on hand of \$5,538.35. The report was accepted, having been audited by Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College.

Professor Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan, reported for the committee on the Federal Tax on Admissions to Games. The report is printed on page 60.

Mr. Frank G. McCormick, University of Minnesota, chairman of the committee to raise funds from the colleges to support the American team for the Olympic Games of 1936, made a strong plea for aid from the colleges in the difficult task of securing contributions, doubly difficult this year because of the strong opposition of a certain group to sending a team to Germany. On this subject the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the N. C. A. A. record its hearty approval of its representatives on the American Olympic Committee, and of

the Committee itself, in their refusal to be influenced by considerations of race, religion, or politics by voting to adhere to the decision that America shall be honorably and adequately represented in the Olympic Games of 1936; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the N. C. A. A. urge upon its constituent universities, colleges, and collegiate conferences generous financial support of the American Olympic team.

The Secretary presented a report, which will be found in full on pages 106-113, giving the result of a questionnaire addressed to the presidents of colleges belonging to the Association on the subject of the code adopted by the Convention last year in the matter of recruiting and subsidizing athletes. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED

(1) That the N. C. A. A. re-affirms its unalterable adherence to the principles and practice of strict amateurism in the administration of intercollegiate athletics.

(2) That it regrets that the recognized and inherent difficulties in enforcing amateur rules should ever be responsible for leading any of its members to compromise these principles.

(3) That this Association regards any relaxation in the administration of amateur rules as a serious threat to the very life of amateur sport; further, that the present situation represents a real emergency which calls for a mobilization of all the resources of the member institutions—particularly the presidents and boards of trustees who have final power and responsibility for university policies, and whose sympathetic and effective support of faculty committees and athletic directors is essential to success in their effort to combat these evils.

(4) That a special committee of three (3) be appointed by the president to make a thorough study of all the influences that are in any way inimical to the best interests of intercollegiate sport and threaten its very existence; this committee to report at the next Convention.

In accordance with these resolutions, the President appointed a committee consisting of Professor Z. G. Clevenger, Indiana University, chairman, Professor P. O. Badger, New York University, and Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College.

The Convention discussed at some length the place of meeting next year, whether New York, Chicago, New Orleans, or St. Louis, from all of which invitations had been received. The matter was left in the hands of the Executive Committee, with power, and they were instructed, before coming to a decision,

to conduct a preferential ballot among the member colleges in order to ascertain their preference.

On recommendation of the nominating committee the following officers were elected for 1936:

President, Major J. L. Griffith, Chicago.
Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.

Vice-presidents:

Mr. Malcolm Farmer, Yale University, 1st district
Professor H. Diederichs, Cornell University, 2nd district.
Professor W. C. Smith, Tulane University, 3rd district.
Professor R. W. Aigler, University of Michigan, 4th district
Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College, 5th district
Professor E. W. McDiarmid, Texas Christian University, 6th district.
Dr. A. C. Nelson, University of Denver, 7th district
Professor H. C. Willett, University of Southern California, 8th district.

1936 COUNCIL MEETING

The 1936 Council met after the Convention adjourned on Saturday, and elected the following members at large of the Council: Mr. Romeyn Berry, Cornell University; Professor C. L. Brewer, University of Missouri; Professor R. A. Fetzner, University of North Carolina; Professor H. J. McIntyre, University of Washington; Dean E. L. Mercer, University of Pennsylvania; Professor W. E. Metzenthin, University of Texas; and Professor L. W. St. John, Ohio State University. The Executive Committee were all re-elected, namely (in addition to the president and the secretary, *ex-officio*) Professor P. O. Badger, Mr. Romeyn Berry, Director W. J. Bingham, Dean E. L. Mercer, Dr. J. E. Raycroft, Dean R. L. Sackett, and Professor L. W. St. John.

REPORTS OF DISTRICTS

FIRST DISTRICT

PRESIDENT TYLER DENNETT, WILLIAMS COLLEGE

The reports from the colleges included in the First District, all of which are in New England, warrant a feeling of optimism for another year such as has not characterized the recent history of athletics in this area. Whereas a year ago there was a drift approaching discouragement with reference to the decline of popular interest as registered in attendance at intercollegiate athletic events, the reports for the current year indicate not only that the decline has been arrested but that the tendency is toward a restoration of public support. There seems to have been a considerable increase over a year ago in gate receipts. There is no probability of further curtailment of sports for financial reasons. As a matter of fact, some sports which were for financial reasons in recent years abandoned have been restored.

The dependence, partial or complete, of intercollegiate athletics on public attendance at games is by no means free from embarrassments. Complaints have been persistent over a number of years, and still continue, about the conduct of the public, especially at football games. However, the criticisms seems to be directed mainly at games which are played either in or adjacent to large centers of population, or which are athletic events of national interest. The difficulty is much less among the undergraduates than among those not in any way directly associated with the colleges or universities which participate in the contests. Certainly the trend is not a wholesome one. The amount of drinking, and even of intoxication, among the spectators casts a shadow over the wholesomeness of amateur intercollegiate sport. The latter, however, is dependent in part upon the patronage of a public which does not yield readily to any control which the college or university can establish. It is notable that the criticisms diminish and practically disappear in proportion as the games are purely collegiate rather than national in character, as in the case of the smaller colleges.

It is believed that the colleges of the First District, while perhaps not antiseptically pure, are remarkably free from evils of proselytization and subsidizing which give such concern to lovers of amateur sports in some of the other areas.

Considerable sentiment appears for the creation of a hockey league among the New England colleges.

There is observable a growing desire in the New England colleges to view intercollegiate athletics not merely as an undergraduate extra-curricular activity supported by enthusiastic alumni, but rather as a legitimate part of the educational program

of the college. It may be considered as organically related, on the one hand, to the inculcation of wholesome ideals of sportsmanship, and, on the other hand, as having a direct bearing on the entire health program of the institutions concerned. There still remains in many colleges the debate as to whether it is feasible to consolidate the direction of athletics and supervision of health in a unified system, but the difficulty in the smaller colleges, where the programs are less ambitious and less complicated, is notable.

SECOND DISTRICT

DEAN R. L. SACKETT, PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE

Those institutions which replied to my inquiry concerning the state of athletics mentioned:

(a) *Participation.* A larger number of students participating in sports. Intramural contests are increasing and a large percentage of the students are taking part.

(b) *Gate Receipts.* Reports differ concerning income from gate receipts. In the majority it is increasing, in some there is little improvement. Deficits are probable in some instances, with a possible limitation on participation in order to reduce budgets.

(c) *Professionalism.* The belief is rather generally expressed that subsidies are being given athletes. Perhaps rumors exaggerate the prevalence. Some hear evidence which seems to support their belief but it would be difficult to obtain facts. An aggressive authority could probably obtain sufficient evidence to prove embarrassing. Rumors of professionalism are confined entirely to intercollegiate football teams.

One of my correspondents reports that at the Atlantic City meeting of the Middle Atlantic States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Commission on Higher Institutions reported, "We are reluctantly forced to the conclusion that it is not feasible to enforce the standards we have set up, against the evident belief on the part of a number of colleges that the subsidizing of athletes is a proper procedure." "In many cases, we know that there are institutions living up to the standard of the Association in letter and in spirit. In others, the indications of extensive subsidizing of athletes in a number of institutions are so clear that it is difficult to see how an efficient administration can be blind to what is evidently going on. To obtain positive evidence is impossible with the means at our disposal." On the other hand, the National Association of State Universities at its meeting in Washington in November passed resolutions condemning all forms of athletic subsidy and practi-

cally pledging the institutions to the enforcement of this principle.

Baseball, track, soccer, boxing, wrestling, swimming, and other intercollegiate sports seem to be in a healthy condition and are holding their own or increasing in popularity.

THIRD DISTRICT

DR. WILBUR C. SMITH, TULANE UNIVERSITY

The Third District, embracing eleven Southern states, may set a noteworthy example during the coming year in recognizing and adopting frank measures dealing with so called athletic subsidization.

The trend is definitely in that direction in this district.

The situation, in the Southeastern Conference, which has a membership of thirteen major institutions, furnishes a concrete illustration of this trend toward meeting the most bothersome subject in intercollegiate athletics in a candid and open manner.

Dr. John J. Tigert, president of the University of Florida, and president of the Southeastern Conference in 1935, took a very commendable public stand during the late summer when he recited just what his institution considered proper in assisting worthy students who competed in athletics.

Dr. Tigert's stand apparently struck the keynote for the Conference as a whole, which was promptly reflected by the executive committee of the Conference when it proposed and adopted the following resolution at its September meeting:

"Be it resolved: That athletes may receive for their athletic services any aid, such as scholarships, work, or other financial assistance, such as any other student may receive for participation in any other activity. Such aid, however, shall not be in excess of the legitimate expenses of attending the institution, as represented by tuition, fees, books, board and lodging."

It was then voted by the executive committee that this report should be submitted to the Conference as a whole at its next annual meeting. (Note: This resolution will probably be presented to the Conference at its December, 1935, meeting.)

If such a resolution is finally adopted, it undoubtedly will rescind all present rules and regulations on the subject.

A questionnaire addressed to the athletic directors of the ten members of the Southern Conference, the other major organization in the third district, definitely indicates that the athletic directors might give favorable consideration to a similar proposal if such were submitted.

Nine of the ten members replied affirmatively, some of them emphatically, to the following question:

"Do you favor giving athletic scholarships when the candidates qualify as worthy of help and of promising scholastic ability?"

One athletic director, in filling out the reply, stated: "Emphatically 'yes' if athletes get only bare expenses. In my opinion, the real trouble is the evasion of our regulations."

Another said "Yes, under supervision of college authorities."

A third replied that he could see "no harm in helping a worthy boy."

It is also of interest to note that some of the smaller colleges, not affiliated with either the Southeastern Conference or the Southern Conference, frankly commented on the needs for meeting the situation without evasion.

Thus, it is to be gathered that most institutions in the third district would probably favor a uniform and frank rule to cover the question and thus permanently eliminate the problems and evils that have grown out of meeting the situation independently. At the best, under the existing methods of dealing with the situation, the set-up has been unsatisfactory and open to charges of hypocrisy, bringing unfavorable criticism from many quarters. Regardless of what fate may be in store for such proposals at this time in the third district, it is interesting to note that the problem—for certainly it has been a major problem everywhere—is commanding earnest and frank attention.

Moreover, I believe that we have laid undue stress on the word "subsidization." Actually, if giving tuition, a scholarship, or a job to an athlete constitutes subsidizing, I wonder if the institutions are not subsidizing a major part of their student bodies. Scholarships are being offered in many colleges to those who excel in debate, oratory, music, and sundry other fields of endeavor, and also to honor students.

That football is gaining in popularity with the populace in the South is undeniably shown in the report from all Southern Conference and Southeastern Conference members. Last year, I reported that twelve institutions of the twenty-three in the two conferences showed an increase in gate receipts, six reported a decrease, and five stated that the financial income from football was about the same as the previous year.

The report this year is even more encouraging and especially impressive when it is considered that the advance sustains the increased attendance trends of 1934. This year, thirteen of the twenty-three report an increase, three report a decrease, and seven state that the receipts were practically unchanged.

Of the thirteen reporting an increase, two stated that their receipts had shown a marked rise, while the decrease in the three cases reported was very slight except in one instance.

Tulane University, for example, drew proportionately the same total attendance in 1935 as in 1934, although the team lost four games this year and only one last year.

Eight of the twenty-three major conference institutions reported that their general athletic program had been enlarged, while the others said their programs this year was the same as a year ago.

Five reported that the required work program had been increased, one announced a decrease, and the others were virtually unchanged.

Twelve of the institutions stated that the scholastic marks of student athletes were higher than those of the average student, ten said the marks were average, and one reported that the student athlete was a fraction of a point below the general average.

Eight institutions reported that receipts from minor sports increased slightly last year, two showed a decrease, and the others were about the same.

Athletic equipment costs were about the same over the two conferences, seven reporting an increase, seven a slight decrease, and the others budgeted the same amount as a year before. Larger or smaller squads varied the expenditures more than anything else.

All in all, the athletic condition of the universities in the third district appears to be on a sounder basis than at any time since 1929.

FOURTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR C. L. EDDY, CASE SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCE

The Fourth District comprises the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and in it are located some 54 colleges and universities. All but six of these institutions are members of some governing conference, consequently intercollegiate competition in this district is well regulated and on a relative high plane.

Most of the conferences are made up of from six to ten members, comprising institutions somewhat similar in size and with ideas and ideals which are common. Such a conference operates successfully because it is possible to make a set of rules that is satisfactory to all and to establish the mutual confidence that the rules are being observed. There is, however, one group of twenty-five institutions, ranging in size from a large state university with thousands of students to the small college with a few hundred students, trying to operate under a set of rules that, for a part at least, represent the opinions of a bare majority of the members. In so large a conference it is impossible to

schedule games between all of the institutions represented, consequently some of the schools, competing year after year with more or less traditional rivals, find that they are being governed by institutions with which they not only have no competition but likewise with which they have little of common interest. While the rules adopted by this conference with reference to eligibility are sound and the ideals back of the inclusion of so many institutions in the conference are fine, in practical operation it is too large. It would seem that better results might be obtained and all round better feeling established if the conference confined its actions to matters of eligibility only and permitted the formation of several playing leagues, these groups making all of their own rules, except those pertaining to eligibility.

Practically all institutions in the district have shared in the general improvement of financial conditions, showing increases in attendance varying from 5% to 25% over last year. These increases have been sufficient to abate somewhat the more or less frenzied recruiting of students in general, but there are no indications that the recruiting of athletes has abated. In fact, this soliciting of athletes seems to have become so general that it is assumed to be the accepted practice. The situation is deplored by many, but self preservation compels them to enter the competition. The establishment of a "price code" does not eliminate the "chiseler" in educational institutions any more than it does in business, for which, probably, the institutions are to blame.

Personally, I am concerned more with the effect on the athlete of this competition than I am with the fact that there is competition between institutions. While it may be admitted that no institution makes the athlete an offer in the form of a scholarship, loan, or opportunity to work that is not open to all students, still a boy who receives several such offers feels that his services are being bid for, therefore he must get as much as he can and go to the highest bidder. Whether or not harm is done to the boy depends upon what happens to him after he gets into the institution of his choice. Evidently, the function of an educational institution is to educate, but unfortunately there is a difference of opinion as to what constitutes an education. The crime committed by institutions is not in the competition for the sale of their goods but in the delivery of those goods, and athletic directors should not make the rules governing delivery.

Few institutions conduct athletics independent of the gate receipts, and, while money is not the primary consideration in making a schedule, still all are interested in the financial outcome of the season. Taken as a whole, gate receipts at football games this season showed an increase of approximately 15% over last year. However, many small colleges, especially those with losing teams, have had a smaller gate than last year. Some institutions have slightly reduced the price of admission to games, others

have slightly increased it, resulting in a general level approximately the same as last year.

There is a difference of opinion with reference to the broadcasting of football games. Most of the larger institutions broadcast their important games, feeling that the number of their friends interested so far exceeds their seating capacity that broadcasting is not likely to reduce their attendance. On the other hand the smaller institutions feel that broadcasting definitely cuts down their attendance and hence it is not a wise policy to broadcast.

Some of the larger institutions have started a campaign of education to stop excessive drinking at football games. This is carried on through alumni publications, the daily newspapers, the radio, etc., but progress is expected to be slow. The smaller schools are not afflicted in this respect as are the larger, so the situation is not considered as presenting a serious problem.

FIFTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR H. H. KING, KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

The fifth district includes the states of North and South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. This is an area of several hundred thousand square miles. Within this area are some 16 athletic conferences of importance, with a membership of over 80 colleges. Several junior college conferences are also to be found in this area.

Last year a district meeting was held in Kansas City, Missouri, at which over 50% of the various conferences of the district were represented. It was thought unwise to attempt such a meeting except possibly every two years in the future.

Attendance.

Football receipts were generally on the increase over last year. Several important games were played in the rain which materially reduced attendance, but public interest appeared to be quite intense.

Injuries.

I cannot recall a year in recent times when so many players on our major teams were injured. No deaths occurred in the larger conferences, but some players were injured to such a degree as to prevent their taking part in football for the remainder of the season and a rather alarming number were incapacitated for briefer periods of time.

One cannot point to any single cause of all these injuries, but

from my own personal observation I feel the so-called "slow whistle" may be a contributing factor. No doubt our football committee will give these matters proper attention.

The N. C. A. A. Code.

The code prepared for the N. C. A. A. by a committee headed by Professor Z. G. Clevenger of Indiana University received almost universal approval in the fifth district. In all the larger conferences of this district control of athletics is centered in school officials, and there is actually faculty control. This does not of itself guarantee absolute conformity with all the provisions of the code, but it is certainly a good set-up for such action.

Of the nine points mentioned in the code I feel those most frequently disregarded in this district are numbers 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6. I know of no institution in the district that offers loans, scholarship aid, or remission of fees through channels not open to non-athletes equally with athletes. Very little proselyting is evident (No. 7 of the code). Items 8 and 9 meet with approval from practically all. On the whole, the most flagrant violations of the code are to be found in the initiating of correspondence or conversation, or by arranging for interviews with boys who are prospective athletes, and offering prospective athletes employment. The employment offered is usually hourly work about the campus or with local business concerns or in clubs or fraternities. Seldom in this region is a student paid a wage in excess of the normal wage offered for such employment.

Several of the athletic conferences of this region are operating under rules and regulations as strict in matters of recruiting and subsidizing as those proposed by the committee which wrote the N. C. A. A. Code. There is a whole-hearted attempt on the part of most members of these conferences to live up to these rules and regulations, but instances occur, now and then, when some individual fails to be guided by the spirit if not the letter of the regulation. As an example of the above mentioned rules I will cite Art. IX of the rules and regulations of the "Big Six" Conference. This rule is on subsidization, and reads:

"IX. SUBSIDIZATION.

1. No student shall participate in any intercollegiate contest who has ever received:
 - a. Any subsidy, either directly or indirectly, because he is an athlete,
 - b. Any advance payment for future services,
 - c. Any guarantee of payment which is not conditioned upon the service's being performed in advance of the payment, or

- d. Any payment for services at greater than reasonable and current rates.

2. No student shall participate in any intercollegiate contest who has ever received a loan, scholarship aid, remission of fees, or employment merely because he is an athlete or through channels not open to non-athletes equally with athletes."

The rule is quite similar to the N. C. A. A. Code and is actually in force.

Junior Colleges.

A large number of junior colleges are located in this district. Some of these have formed their own athletic conferences and compete only among themselves, but there are others which compete with small four-year colleges in addition. No uniformity of treatment of the athlete who graduates from the junior college has been established by the larger, degree-granting institutions of this region. Some accept him with junior standing and do not require him first to make up a year of residence before being eligible for athletic competition, while others treat him somewhat as they would any first year man. Difference of opinion also exists as to how much competition should be allowed him in the four-year college when he has possibly competed two years as a junior college athlete. A further complication occurs when some of the junior college competition has been with small four-year colleges. At present the status of the junior college athlete transferring to a senior college is determined by each conference separately. It is hoped a more uniform practice may be evolved in the near future.

Officiating.

Officials play a very important part in all our athletic games. Thoroughly competent officials are difficult to obtain, but it is my opinion that this district is blessed with some good officials and that less and less complaint is being made against officials by the public each year.

SIXTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR E. W. MCDIARMID, TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

The annual report from the Sixth District would be incomplete without a reference to the retirement of Dr. D. A. Penick from the vice-presidency of the district and also from the presidency of the Southwest Athletic Conference. Dr. Penick has served the Southwest Athletic Conference for twelve years as

its president, in which time he had become the recognized leader in the district in the management and direction of intercollegiate activities in this section. He had attempted to retire from active connection with athletics in the Southwest on several previous occasions, but he acceded to the solicitation of his colleagues and continued in office. In December, 1934, he resigned from the presidency of the Southwest Athletic Conference against the wishes of his associates and withdrew from active participation in conference athletics. Very properly the Southwest Athletic Conference presented Dr. Penick with a splendid testimonial in which he was lauded "for his magnificent leadership in athletics in the Southwest; for the splendidly fair and impartial manner in which he has adjudicated the innumerable problems of eligibility presented to him; for the great insistence he has continually placed upon the highest ideals of fair play and sportsmanship; for the steady advance which has been accomplished largely as a result of his devoted leadership." Dr. Penick continues as tennis coach at the University of Texas and he may be counted upon for rich counsel and advice as occasion permits.

For the first time the Southwest has arisen to the very summit of publicity and achievement because of the unexampled success of its leading football teams. Three of these teams are almost universally named among the five or six leading teams in the country and Southern Methodist University by reason of its selection for the Rose Bowl contest has taken its place at the very top. Texas Christian University has accepted an invitation to meet Louisiana State University in the Sugar Bowl at New Orleans on New Year's Day. This splendid record has brought great satisfaction to the Southwest and has given a gratifying demonstration of the athletic prowess of athletes and coaches whose light in the past has been somewhat obscured. At the same time the tremendous interest in football and the excessive publicity have presented to our Southwest colleges the usual problems which such overwhelming success entails. Our football schedules have been long beyond all reason. The season has consisted in some instances of eleven, twelve, and even thirteen games. The inevitable penalty has been paid for this in the disruption of academic schedules and in the loss of time for academic pursuits. In plainer words, on more than one notable day cessation of all class room work has been the result. It remains to be seen just how our athletes will come through these impossible schedules so far as their academic record is concerned.

Intersectional games between Southwestern teams and college teams from Detroit, Pittsburgh, Washington, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Omaha have been played either in the Southwest or in these cities. There has been almost a mania for such intersectional games and the demands still persist that we in the Southwest shall compete with teams North, East, and West. It is quite generally agreed among us that the best

interests of our colleges demand a shortening of our football schedules and greater conservatism along the line of intersectional games. It remains to be seen whether the demands of the populace shall prevail or whether the sound, sober judgment of faculty members shall wisely control this situation.

In this connection, a question which is perennial in the Southwest pops up again for discussion and, let us hope, final settlement. It is the matter of faculty control of athletics. The tremendous interest, in football especially, has aroused more than the usual interest on the part of alumni and in some cases on the part of trustees. These gentlemen, who show little or no interest in intercollegiate debating or any other college activity, sometimes give the impression that they consider themselves supremely qualified to manage directly athletic affairs without the intervention of faculty members. We need light in the Southwest on this particular problem, and we should like to know very exactly from older conferences and colleges just how they succeed in dealing with alumni and trustees who would take out of the hands of the faculty the business of athletic management and control.

Following the example of other conferences, the Southwest Athletic Conference has completed the plan of appointing officials for football and basketball games through the hands of the president of the Conference. He has the assistance of two other representatives: one from the officials themselves and one from the athletic directors. The plan has been in effect during the past season and appears to have worked admirably. The officials were appointed far in advance of the season, the appointments were accepted with no objections whatever, and the officials have done most satisfactory work in nearly every game. The same plan is to be followed in the ensuing basketball season.

Another innovation in the Southwest has been the securing of a sponsor for the broadcasting of football games. One of the leading oil companies in the Southwest secured the privilege of broadcasting upon the payment of \$14,000 to the S. A. C., which was distributed equally among the seven conference institutions. The payment of this amount gave the company the right to broadcast any and all games at their option. Where the option was exercised an additional sum of \$300 was paid to the home institution. This plan netted about \$3000 to each conference institution. This arrangement was entered into experimentally, and as the result appears to be quite satisfactory it will probably be continued for another season.

The largest crowds in the history of the Southwest have attended the football games this season. The crucial battle between the two leading teams of the Southwest at Fort Worth brought together the second largest attendance in the history of Texas, 36,000 people being in the stadium at Fort Worth. Governor Alfred, who was present to see the game, declared

that he had never seen a more orderly crowd and one more easily controlled. There has been a definite effort made to control the matter of drinking and disorderly conduct at our football games, and from the behavior of this crowd at Fort Worth it appears that these efforts have been quite successful.

It is generally agreed that colleges engaging in intercollegiate athletics should have membership in a sound athletic conference. There are in the Southwest some colleges which are at present unattached, so to speak. In some cases this is not entirely the fault of these colleges. Some of our conferences are opposed to any increase in their membership. Particularly is that the case with the Southwest Conference, which consists of seven members and which has consistently rejected the application of other institutions seeking admission. This was done largely because of the unwillingness to disturb what is an ideal membership numerically and to a less extent geographically. It is to be hoped that every unattached college will find its proper alignment in due time. It is to be noted that Saint Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas, has again taken up intercollegiate athletics and has put on the field an excellent football team, despite the fact that Saint Mary's University dropped intercollegiate athletics three years ago "with an almost audible sigh of relief on the part of the whole faculty." There is a world of meaning in this little bit of history. Members of the faculty breathe a great sigh of relief when the football season is over, and after a suitable pause for refreshment of spirit "they seek it yet again,"—it being the thrill and excitement of the football season.

The writer has long thought that in justification of faculty integrity, some reference should be made to the number of athletes who are declared ineligible for participation or who are dropped from the roster through scholastic ineligibility. The criticism is frequently heard that first-class athletes are protected from scholastic failure by partial treatment from faculty members. It is not advisable to publish delinquency records, but those of us who have looked into the matter can testify to the fact that athletes in the Southwest are held pretty strictly to account, and that many most promising athletes fail to enter into intercollegiate activities because of scholastic ineligibility which has overtaken them.

The year just closing has been one of the most successful seasons the Southwest has ever had. It is to be hoped that it has been a year of real progress. The age-old problems still persist, particularly the engagement of athletes on a more or less commercial basis, and the peddling of services on the part of star athletes. In the face of these problems and other problems of equal moment, the faculty representatives in the Southwest are united in spirit, hopeful in action, and agreed in their determination to maintain a higher level of athletic participation

and sportsmanship, presenting a determined opposition to the persistent evils that tend to degrade what otherwise would be an entirely wholesome activity.

SEVENTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR J. C. FITTERER, COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

With the variety of climate and geographical relief encountered in the seventh district, which extends from the Canadian to the Mexican border, it is not surprising to find corresponding differences in athletic sports. The centers of population are largely concentrated in the region bordering the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, in the localities west of the continental divide, and in the productive valley of Great Salt Lake. State and privately fostered institutions of learning have grown apace, and with their development scholastically athletic sports of many kinds have received due support from both students and faculty, primarily that a sound mind might be housed within a sound body. Four athletic conferences are found operating within this district; namely, the Pacific Coast, the Montana, the Rocky Mountain, and the Border, all of which are governed by appropriate rules and by-laws for the conduct of athletics and athletes.

The three major sports, football, basketball, and baseball, continue to largely rule the activities during the autumn, winter, and spring, with track contests furnishing interesting diversion, particularly for those not wishing to contend in the former. During the past year football attendance has slightly decreased compared with 1934, due possibly to unfavorable weather conditions. A recent summary affords the following comparative statement for the years 1934 and 1935 pertaining to the three largest universities of the district:

	Games	Attendance	Games	Attendance
Denver University	10	89,676	7	88,750
Colorado University	3	27,972	3	31,689
Utah University	4	55,469	4	49,916
Totals	17	175,117	16	170,255

Apparently at the beginning of the season the attendance is at a peak, then declines somewhat in a slowly lowering curve until the approach of the Thanksgiving games, when it begins to ascend and reaches its final climax upon the latter occasion. The rules of the Rocky Mountain Conference contain a pronouncement limiting the length of the season, namely:

"Rule 46. The football season shall be considered as beginning not earlier than the last week in September and as closing on the Saturday immediately following Thanksgiving Day. The sched-

uling of any game before the former date or after the latter date will not be approved except by special Conference action based upon a request from the faculty of the institution concerned."

Nearly all of the colleges of this district report a substantial increase in students, and with the increase in attendance we naturally look for added interest in collegiate athletics in the future.

A greater range of sports is becoming apparent and contests are provided in tennis, wrestling, boxing, fencing, swimming, golf, gymnastics, ski-ing, and ice hockey. Some portions of the district are peculiarly adapted for the last two—in the mountains of the Rockies from the central to the northern parts.

Most institutions now provide medical attendance and physical inspection to a greater or lesser degree by duly retained and qualified persons attached to the departments of physical education, and as a result serious injuries are seldom sustained, or, if incurred, are quickly alleviated.

Intramural contests are assuming a fixed place in the life of our institutions, and the hope is expressed that they may serve as feeders for intercollegiate sports, but if not, at least as extending the benefits of athletic training more generally throughout the student body.

"Pep meetings" are still quite the vogue preceding a close contest, and the spectacle of the professor with graying hair and failing voice being dragged from his comfortable study on a blustery night to a bonfire on the campus, at which and before which he inspires the youngsters to do and die for good old alma mater, very often finds a counterpart today. Youth and age—but a few years apart at most.

There seems to be a growing tendency in the district for football teams to compete with other teams outside of their respective conferences, especially with those located in the middle west or with others on the Pacific Coast, or with Hawaii.

Near the larger cities students often find themselves members of local country clubs and acquire proficiency in golf and allied sports. Tournaments are provided under the auspices of clubs and colleges, stimulating a healthy, and yet amateur, rivalry.

At those institutions where military training is obligatory during the first two years of residence, rifle shooting contests are staged and entered into under intercollegiate sponsorship. Many enviable records are achieved among our western students, to say nothing of the desirable training of eye and hand.

No new stadium or other extensive construction has taken place during the past year, and yet sufficient expenditures have been made to keep the personnel and the various activities in efficient condition. For the major part, athletics have paid for themselves under a wise and restrained administration. Very few, if any, colleges find themselves burdened with past outlays

for excessive expansion in stadium construction not warranted by the passing years. On the whole, finances are in an excellent state in spite of the industrial-economic struggles gripping the nation throughout its length and breadth.

The west present some anomalous features at times, for example, yacht racing on Grand Lake, at the headwaters of the Colorado River, at an altitude of slightly more than one and one-half miles above sea level; not by students directly, but by some of our faculty members, and others with a lurking penchant for the noble sport of their forebears.

Broadcasting of the principal events has been quite general in the neighborhood of Denver and Salt Lake City during the past year. How much this practice may have affected the gate receipts remains a moot question. It has been discussed at length, pro and con, but without arriving at a definite conclusion, or any concerted action.

By and large, athletics are in a better condition today than they were yesterday, and a gentleman's agreement among gentlemen means as much or more than a solemn bond

EIGHTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR H. C. WILLETT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The rise and fall of the prosperity curve on the Atlantic seaboard usually precedes by several months the corresponding fluctuations of that curve on the Pacific Coast. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that we cannot at this time entirely duplicate the enthusiastic reports of athletic prosperity that come to us in newspaper dispatches from the Eastern states, but we can report that the upward trend in athletic conditions observed last year continues. Over ninety per cent of the colleges and universities in the district have reported in writing to the district representative on the condition of intercollegiate athletics in their respective communities. Their reports show forward progress in the following particulars: (1) The addition or the restoration of a large number of minor sports not included in their athletic programs for 1934-35; (2) increased attendance at home football contests at fifty per cent of the institutions, and attendance at least as good as last year at an additional twenty-five per cent of the institutions; and (3) the ability of ninety per cent of the institutions to finance their athletic programs this year from gate receipts, supplemented in most cases by student fees.

The reports of the colleges this year make clear the necessity of drawing two pictures, instead of one, to depict the true condition of intercollegiate athletics in the eighth district. In the one picture should be placed the larger institutions, wealthy in

endowments or supported from state funds, numbering approximately one-third of the four-year colleges in the district. In the other picture, the remaining two-thirds of the colleges, most of them with comparatively small enrollments and all of them struggling against adversities brought on by a long depression and striving to maintain, without adequate private or public support, athletic programs attractive to their own students and to the communities in which they are located.

The first of these two pictures would have a decidedly rosy tint. The larger institutions in the district have apparently few athletic worries, unless it be that some of them are slightly annoyed at having to do without some of the luxuries to which more prosperous years have accustomed them. The picture of the smaller colleges would have more somber tones. The perplexing athletic problems faced by these smaller institutions commands our sympathetic attention, even though we may not be able to aid much in their solution. Composite statements of their most troublesome problems would run somewhat as follows: (1) How to finance the kind of athletic programs demanded by students, alumni, and constituents; (2) how to lure the public through the turnstiles away from the radio broadcasting of major games; (3) how to halt emigration of good local athletes to the larger institutions; (4) how to maintain high standards in the face of the demands of local civic clubs for winning teams in order that larger student bodies may satisfy local pride; (5) how to secure dates in municipal stadia; (6) how to hold the loyalty of local fans without allowing them to interfere with the control of athletics. This does not complete the recital of the problems of the smaller colleges. It is evident, however, that financial difficulties are in a large measure responsible for the athletic woes of these institutions.

One of the state colleges on the Pacific Coast, which has recently changed its status from that of a teachers college to a general college, has in a rather daring manner attempted to solve at least some of the problems which face the smaller institutions. With permission, I here quote the report of the Director of Athletics of the San José State College (California) on the much publicized and little understood "San José Board and Room Plan".

"In response to your postscript requesting special information, I am glad to respond briefly, as follows:

- a. San José State College is essentially an institution catering to boys and girls of very limited means.
- b. We have no dormitories, no living-group fraternities or sororities, and no student union in which to house students.
- c. A very large percentage of our students work for part or all of their college expenses.
- d. Most of our athletes are physical education or industrial arts

majors, both of which require long hours of class attendance; a majority attend from 8:00 or 9:00 A. M. to 4:00 P. M., daily.

c. Careful investigation, over a period of years, has revealed that our athletes, especially football players, have been:

1. Batching—three to five in a two or three room apartment.
2. Eating only one or two meals a day.
3. Carrying fifteen or more units of college work (forty-five hours per five-day week).
4. Trying to carry loads which would make them the equivalent of their room and board.
5. And consequently getting inadequate rest, doing poor work in studies, and becoming weak and nervous.

On a case method basis, this past spring an investigation of varsity football players was conducted which disclosed that about twenty-five boys out of a squad of sixty were definitely carrying impossible and dangerous loads.

Arrangements were made with the local Y. M. C. A. to house this group during the fall quarter at a very small cost. Further arrangements were made with our own (the College) Home Economics Departments to run a training table during the football season where this group would be fed a well cooked and properly balanced diet. The cost of this table, with Home Economics girls and the boys themselves doing most of the work, except the cooking and planning, amounted to less than one dollar per day. The table operates only five days per week.

The above comprises the much publicized "San José State Room and Board Plan". It is not paid for out of football gate receipts, since these fall far short of meeting even the bare costs of carrying on our football program. No proselyting of high school boys has been carried on. An effort is being made merely to aid *bona fide* students who otherwise would have to give up one or more phases of their regular college program. No boys who live at home or could live at home and still attend school are eligible for this aid.

The results have been most gratifying. An improved spirit among the boys who have received help has been most noticeable. Several who were near the breaking point last year have developed into outstanding leaders. The morale of the entire group is distinctly superior.

The scholarship of the group, with two exceptions, has been raised, on the average, almost one full grade. (No boy, by the way, will be carried on the list who at any time falls below a passing grade in any of his subjects.)

The increased weight and fine physical appearance of the boys has been commented upon by faculty and townspeople alike. In every case, without exception, there has been a marked improvement over their physical condition of last year.

In the entire group there has been only one case of sickness, other than colds, during the entire season. Except for the usual accidents incident to football, every boy has been in perfect condition to engage in this strenuous sport, without endangering his health and well-being.

From our standpoint, the plan has been an experiment, but a mighty interesting and worthwhile one. From the standpoint of the boys, it has been a God-send. We are convinced it is educationally sound and decidedly worthwhile in an institution such as ours.

Trusting that the above answers your questions, and assuring you that I shall be glad to furnish any further information you may desire, I am

Very truly yours,

DUDLEY S. DeGROOT,
Director of Physical Education for Men."

The above report is offered simply for the purpose of placing before the National Collegiate Athletic Association a truer picture of the San José plan than could possibly be gained from newspaper accounts, which in many cases have not done justice to an experiment conceived and carried out with great sincerity of purpose.

Turning to the larger institutions in the district, comparatively few troublesome problems have been reported in answer to the direct inquiry "What is your most troublesome problem?" Apparently the general lot of the larger institutions is a happy one compared with that of the smaller colleges.

Contributing to the picture of the condition of athletics in the eighth district is the confession of faith in the worthwhileness of intercollegiate athletics on the part of faculty, men who voted almost unanimously that athletics as conducted in their respective institutions are worthwhile. Only two seem to have lost faith, attributing their loss of faith to the fact that college athletes in general no longer adhere to true amateur standards, and that the necessity of scheduling intercollegiate contests with an eye to financial returns has robbed intercollegiate sports of much of their former value.

At the 1934 meeting of the N. C. A. A. the junior college problem was given some attention. It may be of interest to report that within the eighth district more than 30,000 students are enrolled in two-year junior colleges. There are 58 junior colleges, private and public, in the state of California alone, with an enrollment of approximately 29,000 students. The area of athletics represented by the junior colleges is one that cannot be ignored in a report of this kind. At the present time we find four junior college conferences in the district, each one of them facing problems similar to those faced by every intercollegiate conference in its formative years. The junior college conferences are gradually evolving regulations suitable to the junior college situation, and the stabilizing effect of these regulations is beginning to be felt on the Pacific Coast. It is probably needless to say that the harmonious working together of junior college and college conferences is greatly to be desired. We bespeak for the junior college conferences in our district the sympathetic cooperation of the college conferences throughout the country, and of the N. C. A. A. in particular.

It is to be reported that professional football is apparently no more firmly entrenched in the eighth district than it was twelve months ago. There are indications that its present existence is at best precarious. Professional football thrives in only one section of the district, namely, Los Angeles, where a large Sunday sports-loving public contribute a few thousand spectators each Sunday to view games between teams composed of local talent. Outside of Los Angeles, professional games seem to be limited to occasional local games in central and northern Cali-

fornia under the auspices of the American Legion. One important factor that has caused a retardation in the development of professional football has been the rule adopted by the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference prohibiting members of the athletic staffs of member institutions from coaching professional teams, from officiating at professional games, and from playing as members of professional teams. Furthermore the Pacific Coast Conference has taken the stand that officials who wish to officiate at Conference games must not officiate at professional games. There is some indication that these rules of the Pacific Coast Conference will be considered for adoption by other athletic conferences in the district. The anticipated result is a complete divorcement of professional football from intercollegiate football, which will not necessarily harm the professional sport but will most certainly be to the advantage of the intercollegiate game.

In view of the fact that we are observing the thirtieth anniversary of the N. C. A. A. and reviewing the reasons for its existence, it may be of interest to report that the colleges in the eighth district were asked to file with your representative a list of the outstanding athletic problems to which the N. C. A. A. might well turn its attention during the coming year. A considerable number of such problems were submitted, but almost without exception they were problems to which the Association had given particular attention during the past two years. One institution suggested that the N. C. A. A. furnish more data and publicity on what it is attempting to do. This coming from a college which is not a member of our Association suggests that the colleges outside our membership ranks would welcome and possibly profit from wider publicity given to matters considered by the N. C. A. A.

REPORTS OF RULES COMMITTEES

ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL (SOCCER)

The past season was the most successful to date in intercollegiate soccer. The Middle Atlantic and New England leagues are both operating permanently and have increased interest in the game. Every effort should be made to form sectional leagues in other parts of the country.

The Association Football Rules Committee met in New York on January 12, 1935. There were present Mr. A. W. Marsh, Amherst; Mr. Douglas Stewart, Pennsylvania; Mr. N. M. Fleming, Penn State; Mr. Burnham N. Dell, Princeton; and

Mr. Henry W. Clark, Harvard, Chairman of the Committee.

All parts of the country were canvassed as to suggestions on the game and rules changes. The consensus of opinion favored little or no drastic change in the rules and the Committee agreed with this sentiment.

The following changes in the rules were approved:

1. The ball shall be inflated to a pressure of not less than twelve pounds nor more than thirteen pounds at the beginning of the game.
2. The manager's whistle shall end the periods of the game rather than that of the referees.
3. The referees were asked especially to warn and penalize promptly undue or unfair charging of goal keepers.

It is the policy of the Rules Committee to suggest the trial of new ideas in intercollegiate soccer annually. The consensus of opinion was that ways and means of increasing the scoring would increase interest in the game. The Committee suggested, for the past season, that the colleges, in their practice scrimmages or games, try out the removal of all limitations on the throw-in except that the player making the throw-in be outside the field of play.

The rules book was improved by returning to the previous practice of diagramming offside and other tactical situations.

The Intercollegiate Association adopted these rules, so that the intercollegiate game is governed now by uniform rules action.

HENRY W. CLARK,
Chairman

BASKETBALL

The National Collegiate Basketball Committee met as usual in joint session with representatives of other bodies and adopted the basketball rules for the current year. The membership of the group at present in operation is as follows:

- 10 representatives of the National Collegiate
- 4 representatives of the National High School Federation
- 2 representatives of the A. A. U.
- 2 representatives of the Y. M. C. A.
- 2 representatives from Canada, one of them representing the school and college interest, the other representing the Canadian Basketball Association, which corresponds to our A. A. U. of the United States.

It is the belief of your chairman that this ratio of representation adequately and fairly represents the controlling interest as

it should be represented in basketball from the standpoint of the best development of the game, both as to legislation, affecting types and standards of play, and as to the administration of the game with relation to coaching, officiating, and spectator interest.

In order to bring the National Collegiate membership up to date on our present status in basketball rules committee organization, the following items are noted. At the May 4 meeting of the N. C. A. A. Executive Committee, it was moved and carried "that it would best serve the interests of peace, harmony, and efficiency of the Basketball Rules Committee if the N. C. A. A. were to withdraw from association with other groups, and were to make and publish the rules of basketball by itself for the National Collegiate Association and such other bodies as choose to affiliate with it."

Pursuant to this action, other constituent bodies associated with the N. C. A. A. in the formulation of basketball rules were informed of the position taken by the N. C. A. A. Executive Committee, which action had been taken in response to a request from the A. A. U. and the Y. M. C. A. for a return to the old basis of equal representation on this joint Basketball Committee.

At this point, your attention is called to these items which are definitely related. It was understood by your chairman that other constituent bodies having to do with basketball might be invited to continue their association with the N. C. A. A. Basketball Committee on the present basis of representation. It seems highly desirable for the best interest of this game to continue a single code of rules which may govern all basketball played in the United States.

The N. C. A. A. Basketball Committee would like to have other constituent bodies continue the present association with the N. C. A. A. if this can be done on a satisfactory basis. The National High School Federation is apparently satisfied to proceed with the organization as existing. For reasons which do not have to do with effective and satisfactory legislation on rules, both the A. A. U. and the Y. M. C. A. are not pleased with the present representation, but have indicated that they will go along with the N. C. A. A. on the present representation basis until such time as a more satisfactory representation, to them, may be worked out.

The N. C. A. A. basketball group has nothing but the friendliest and most cordial feeling toward both the Y. M. C. A. and the A. A. U., but definitely feels, in line with the Executive Committee resolution of May 4, that unless these organizations are willing to go along with the N. C. A. A. on the present basis, it will be for the best interest for the N. C. A. A. and the National High School Federation to proceed independently.

This is a fair and complete statement of the condition as it now exists. It is my belief that the N. C. A. A. may safely leave

the basketball question in the hands of its Basketball Rules Committee and the N. C. A. A. Executive Committee.

The present basketball code has put into effect two changes calculated to improve the game. First, a further restriction on what is termed the "post-pivot" play, which prohibits any player, with or without the ball, to remain more than three seconds in what is known as the post-pivot position. Preliminary games played thus far clearly indicate that this is a satisfactory rule and makes for better and more interesting play.

The second move directed toward lessening the undue advantage of the extremely tall player reduces the number of jump balls at center by giving the defensive team the ball out of bounds at the end of the floor immediately after a foul goal has been scored. This increases action in the basketball game, as well as lessens the advantage of the extremely tall man, and probably will be followed by still further reduction in the number of balls tossed up at the center circle.

The American Olympic Basketball Committee has agreed upon a method of selection for the Olympic basketball representation of the United States, which is briefly as follows. The N. C. A. A. by setting up ten districts will bring to the final Olympic Tournament five college teams. The A. A. U. by its own method of determination will bring two teams to the Olympic Final. The Y. M. C. A. will bring one team into the Olympic Final. These eight teams representing the United States will compete in a final Olympic Basketball Tournament to select the American Olympic representative for competition in the Olympic Games. It is hoped and believed that this basketball program may be instrumental in raising a considerable amount of money for the American Olympic competition.

L. W. ST. JOHN,
Chairman

BOXING

Meetings.

Two meetings of this committee were held: March 16, 1935, in Director Hugo Bezdek's Office, at State College, Pa., and April 26, 1935, at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Philadelphia.

All members except Mr. Toomey were present at the first meeting. Mr. Toomey who resides on the Pacific Coast has been unable to attend due to this distance, but expects to be present at the meeting during the Christmas holidays. Dr. Francis C. Grant, former chairman of the N. C. A. A. Boxing Rules Committee, also attended this meeting. At the second meeting, Mr. Toomey and Captain Giffen were absent, the latter because of illness in his family.

Rules.

At the first meeting the question of scoring was discussed, and it was decided that the winner of each round would score 10 points; the loser any number below designated by the official. However, no action was taken.

It was suggested for adoption in the code of rules that "each official at the end of the bout must total the scores of the round, write the name of the winner, and sign the score card before collection by the announcer."

After a motion duly made and seconded, four (4) pounds will be allowed over or under the specified weights in each class. (This change was deemed advisable because of some controversy arising last year, as to whether a participant weighing less than the specified weight should be allowed to box; one college official insisted that such men take on additional weight or be not allowed to box.)

Publications.

A separate N. C. A. A. Boxing Guide is in process of being published by the American Sports Publishing Company, and will be ready about January 1st. The material for this Guide was collected by Mr. Hugh Riley of the Public Information Department, Pennsylvania State College. The instructions for officials, contestants, and spectators were prepared by Captain Giffen and submitted to each member of the Committee for corrections and additions. The Southern Conference and the Eastern Inter-collegiate Boxing Associations have each contributed \$75.00 towards the subsidization of this Boxing Guide.

Tournament.

The Committee decided to hold the N. C. A. A. Boxing Tournament at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., March 27 and 28, 1936, under the same conditions as those of the 1932 tournament held at the Pennsylvania State College. This tournament will be the means of selecting representatives for the Olympic Boxing Trials.

Administrative Suggestions.

It was voted that college associations holding annual tournaments be requested to contribute a share of the net receipts for the expenses of the N. C. A. A. Boxing Committee.

It was also suggested that the chairman submit a budget and a tentative business program of the meeting to the members of the Committee in advance of the next meeting.

HUGO BEZDEK,
Chairman.

FENCING

At a meeting of the Committee at the Fencers Club, New York City, December 2, 1935, the following changes in the rules were adopted.

I. Ground Rules.

The section of the rules governing the ground was amended alike for all weapons, as follows:

- (a) The width of the strip shall be six (6) feet. The length of the strip shall be forty (40) feet. Three parallel lines shall be drawn across the strip: the dividing line, one (1) inch wide, in the middle; the two warning lines, four (4) inches wide, on either side of the middle line and ten (10) feet therefrom.
- (b) Warnings other than as provided for by the warning lines shall be discontinued.
- (c) When a contestant, in retreating, crosses the end of the strip with both feet, the bout is stopped and the contestant thus stepping off the strip shall be declared touched.

II. Definition of Sabre Target.

The sabre target comprises all parts of the body, including the head, arms, and hands, above a horizontal line drawn through the highest points of the intersection of the thighs and the trunk of the fencer when in the on-guard position.

HUGH V. ALESSANDRONI,
Chairman

FOOTBALL

In last year's report I stated that the previous season gave clear cut evidence that the game of football required but little tinkering with the rules. Acting on this belief, your Rules Committee made no major change in the 1935 rules, and the result we feel has been most satisfactory.

We think it is safe to say that 1935 was the greatest season football has ever had. In both tactics and strategy coaches made a wonderful advance. The game became more interesting for the players and more exciting for the spectators. Scoring was much more prevalent than in the past, as the offense apparently had greatly improved over the previous seasons. As there was prac-

tically no change in the rules, this improvement indicates rather clearly that with stabilized rules the coaches are able to make better progress in the development of teams than is possible under constantly changing regulations.

The Present Rules Satisfactory

So again your committee feels that suggested changes should be carefully scrutinized and adopted only if it appears that such changes are vitally necessary for the good of the game. Doubtless there will be many suggestions; in fact, a number have already been made. In many cases a single happening in a single game is the basis of the suggestion. If every time that a break in the game caused the defeat of a team we made a change to prevent the recurrence of such a break, the rules would quickly become a mere hodge-podge of exceptions. There are too many rules in the book now that were drafted to cover exceptional cases. That is what makes them so complex. To use a golf term, you cannot eliminate an occasional "rub of the green".

It is interesting to note that the reports from the various districts are unanimous in the expression of a real satisfaction with the game as played during the past autumn. One of our members, who as a coach should be well able to judge, sums it up in the following comment:

The rules as a whole are entirely satisfactory.

- "a. From players' standpoint, hazards have been eliminated.
- "b. From coaches' standpoint, game offers an opportunity for just as diversified play as anyone desires.
- "c. Clarifications have been made to make it easier for officials.
- "d. Spectators find the game most interesting."

The Lateral Pass

The one point on which there is some difference of opinion is as to the value of the Supplemental Note under Rule 7, Section 7, which gives the runner who is on his feet, even though he be held by an opponent, the right to run, pass, or kick until the whistle is blown. This Note was inserted as an experiment with the hope that it might increase the effectiveness of lateral passing without producing any undesirable features. Certainly it had the effect of making coaches "lateral pass conscious", with the result that both in spring and early fall practice the lateral was experimented with to a much greater extent than heretofore. Opinions as to its value as a regular play vary greatly, but there is a fairly pronounced sentiment that the Supplemental Note is not needed, and that the rules would be better without it. Some people feel that this Note is responsible for increased injuries,

but there is no evidence so far from any part of the country that this is so. Perhaps this Note has served its purpose in bringing about widespread experimenting with the lateral pass, and further development of this type of play can proceed without its aid, if indeed it gives any aid. The evidence of the past season would indicate that the offense can get along very well indeed even if the elimination of this Note should handicap it slightly.

Officiating

As usual the officials have had their panning in the newspapers. However, more and more the thoughtful sports writer has come to realize the difficult job an official undertakes and has shown him some mercy, even at times saying a word in his defense. In point of fact there seems to be little doubt that the officiating during the past season has been the most satisfactory in years. Rules interpretations on the field have been uniformly good. Of course, on questions of fact the official's decision is often questioned but—and for this we must thank whatever gods there be—his integrity is never questioned. More than on any other one thing the future of the game of football rests on this feeling that our officials, whatever their faults, are honest. Once let the public doubt their honesty and the situation of football will become most precarious. May I point out that the reason for this rigid integrity over the whole life of the game is that the officials are old football players who love the sport and to whom its future is far more important than the outcome of any game or games.

National Federation of High Schools

This Federation wrote its own rules some three years ago, and these rules, which differ somewhat from the collegiate rules, have been adopted by the high schools of thirteen states. This is an excellent thing in many ways. It is right and proper that the secondary schools, which have first-hand knowledge of the conditions and problems created by the playing of this strenuous game by immature youngsters, should strive to condition the game to the capabilities of these boys. On the other hand, many of these boys eventually go to college, and many school coaches finally secure positions in college ranks. Therefore, it seems essential that the rules of the high school game should not differ any more than is necessary from the rules of the college game. With this in mind, the chairman of your committee and the Executive Committee of the High School Federation have had two meetings during the past year. At the second of these, Major John L. Griffith, President of the N. C. A. A., and Mr. Fielding Yost, member of the N. C. A. A. Rules Committee from

the fourth district, were present. Also at this second meeting the Editorial Committee (which corresponds to our Rules Committee) of the High School Federation was present. The result of these meetings is a working agreement under which every effort will be made to eliminate, as far as possible, the differences between the two sets of rules, and to cooperate in preventing any divergence in the future except where the difference in age and other conditions make such divergence necessary. Our ultimate purpose is to agree, if possible, on a basic set of rules in which the difference between the two games can be noted. At present this is impossible as the arrangement, terminology, and phraseology of the Federation rules is widely different from ours.

Injuries and Fatalities

As this report is being written on the 6th of December in order that it can be printed for the December meeting of the N. C. A. A., it is obviously impossible to make any final comparisons with previous seasons. Mr. Floyd R. Eastwood, of New York University, who, together with Professor Frank S. Lloyd of New York University and Mr. James A. Beha of the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters, are compiling the lists of such injuries and fatalities, will not have received their final data until the lapse of many weeks. However, I do have from Mr. Eastwood a list of fatalities up to November 15th.

In many cases the questionnaire sent out has not yet been answered, but it was already certain that death in 14 cases was not attributable to football of any type. At least two more deaths were the result of playing touch football and not our game. Many of these deaths had such causes as heart failure, infection, pneumonia, etc. One was caused by electrocution where an electric pad was used on a thigh bruise. What the final figures will be for injuries and deaths directly attributable to football I cannot say, but they will certainly be small in comparison with the millions of youths who are playing the game. I should say that it is at least ten times as safe to play football as it is to ride in a motor car. Nevertheless, that is no reason for not continuing and emphasizing our campaign of education as to the necessity of medical examination before a boy is permitted to play, proper equipment, proper coaching and supervision, and, perhaps most important of all, the immediate and careful treatment of all injuries, including—and this is most important—minor cuts and abrasions.

Your committee deplores the tendency on the part of certain spectators to invade the playing field. In some cases this happens while the game is still unfinished. This sort of rowdiness is a real menace to football and often makes a disagreeable finale

to what was otherwise a thrilling and enjoyable spectacle. This is, of course, beyond the province of the Rules Committee, but we recommend that the N. C. A. A. take cognizance of this deplorable tendency and make every effort through its membership to put an end to this silly and dangerous practice.

In reporting to you so soon after the conclusion of the season, your Committee cannot speak finally as to many things, but we will weigh every bit of evidence when we meet in February and endeavour to make our decisions in the best interests of the game.

WALTER R. OKESON,
Chairman

GYMNASTICS

The past year has been a comparatively inactive one for your Committee. No attempt was made to alter the existing rules and regulations because of the forthcoming Olympic Games. There will be changes in the Olympic regulations and those of the International Federation, and these may have direct bearing on any decisions we might make in the future. Your Committee is in close touch with these affairs, as Mr. Hoffer, Mr. Graydon, and Dr. Beling are sitting as members of the American Olympic Gymnastic Committee.

There seems to be renewed interest in collegiate gymnastics, and we expect to see several men from the college ranks competing for places on the Olympic team. We strongly urge all institutions to encourage their best gymnasts to practice the required Olympic exercises and to try for a place on the team.

C. A. BELING, M.D.,
Chairman.

ICE HOCKEY

Much of the discussion at the annual meeting of the Committee was devoted to the clarification of the rules relative to body contact and to the use of sticks. With only slight changes, it was agreed that these rules and their interpretive notes are adequate when enforced.

The adoption of a penalty shot in place of the penalty face-off is one of the changes that was made. This rule has been popular in the professional game and seems fairer than the penalty face-off, due to the method of facing the puck. It will be interesting to note the acceptance of this innovation in ice hockey. It is similar to the penalty-kick in soccer, which has been in use many

years, and it is also somewhat comparable to the free throw in basketball.

In place of a delayed whistle for the infraction of the anti-defense rule, the game is to be immediately stopped and the offending player penalized. The opinion is in favor of upholding the rule in order to prevent a "packed defense", and the fast whistle may again emphasize the rule, as it has been generally disregarded during the past two seasons.

The committee is indebted to Mr. A. G. Smith, president of the Eastern Hockey Officials Association, for attending the meeting and for his excellent contributions to important phases of the rules. For the past two years the secretary of the rules committee, Professor L. F. Keller, of the University of Minnesota, has compiled comprehensive tests on hockey rules. These have been circulated to players, coaches, and officials, and have been very helpful in exploiting the rules of the game.

ALBERT I. PRETTYMAN,
Chairman

LACROSSE

The lacrosse rules as adopted by the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association have been in use generally throughout the Eastern Section of the United States, and there does not seem to be any need for any modification of these rules by the National Collegiate Athletic Association at present.

Probably the most progressive step adopted during the past two years has been to make the out-of-bounds play more nearly like that in use in basketball. This rule has tended to speed up the game and to make it more interesting for the players.

The recommendation of the Rules Committee, giving both officials in the lacrosse game equal authority in calling fouls, has helped considerably.

The reduction in the cost of lacrosse equipment has tended to make the game more popular, both within the colleges and the high schools.

Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the past college year was the international series of games played between an all-star group of college players from the United States and a representative team from the Dominion of Canada, played in Vancouver, Canada, during the past summer. It is the thought of the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association to continue to sponsor such international contests.

HARRY J. ROCKAFELLER,
*President, U. S. Collegiate Lacrosse
Association, also Member of N. C.
A. A. Lacrosse Rules Committee.*

SWIMMING AND WATER SPORTS

In the thirty years since the foundation of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, swimming and water sports have made remarkable progress. According to George Kistler (*Intercollegiate Swimming Guide*, 1915-16, p. 39) the first intercollegiate swimming meet was held in 1897 with Pennsylvania and Columbia participating. In the closing years of the century annual championship races were held among swimmers of Columbia, Pennsylvania, and Yale in the sportsman shows of Boston and New York. In 1906 the Intercollegiate Swimming Association, the first college swimming league in this country, was organized. Swimming developed slightly later in the Intercollegiate Conference. Dual meets were held before the Intercollegiate Swimming Association was organized, but the annual Conference Championship Meet was a later development. It was not until 1913 that the N. C. A. A. appointed its first rules committee for swimming, and when a year later its first report was made at its convention in Chicago only twelve institutions represented in the N. C. A. A. meeting stated that they conducted intercollegiate swimming.

Sports of swimming, diving, and water polo, however, spread rapidly, as may be seen by the directory in the *Intercollegiate Swimming Guide*. In the 1916-17 issue 36 colleges and universities and 34 high and preparatory schools were reported as having swimming pools and inter-institutional teams. In the 1936 Guide the intercollegiate group has been increased to 137, and the interscholastic to 154. Even these figures, however, are apparently incomplete, for the 1930 report of the *North-Central Quarterly* indicates that 195 high schools within the territory of the North-Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools had interscholastic swimming teams. It may be assumed that interscholastic swimming in the combined other four regional accrediting agencies would approximate a number bringing the total up to at least 400 interscholastic teams in the United States.

The relationships of our committee with those of the A. A. U., Y. M. C. A., National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, and the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee have been friendly and cooperative. For several years now the National Championships of the N. C. A. A. and the A. A. U. have been held in the same general region of the United States, and on successive week ends so that contestants may attend both meets as a climax to their indoor season. In 1935 the N. C. A. A. Championships were held at Harvard, and the A. A. U. in New York City the following week.

For more than a dozen years the Rules Committee has been cooperating with the swimming committees of the A. A. U. and the American Olympic Men's Swimming Committee for the development of uniform rules, and the best American participation

in international swimming, diving, and water polo in the Olympic Games. In Olympic years our National Championships have been offered and accepted as preliminary Olympic tryouts and the net proceeds have been contributed to the Olympic Men's Swimming budget. The same policy is to be followed in 1936. The Committee recommends that the next meet be held at Yale University on March 27 and 28, 1936, where with an excellent pool, large seating capacity, and strong following in swimming, a maximum return should be derived for the benefit of the Olympic budget. Yale University also has offered the fine housing facilities of the Ray Tompkins House to the visiting contestants without charge.

A number of schools and colleges have likewise agreed to assist in these fund raising activities. Bowdoin College, under the leadership of Coach Miller, a former member of this committee, has the distinction of having staged the first Olympic water carnival in an American college in the present Olympiad. The benefit was held at the close of the swimming season last spring and yielded a little over a hundred dollars. Representatives from Amherst, Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Lehigh, Pennsylvania, Rutgers, Yale, and Mercersburg have assured our committee of their willingness to stage such benefits. It may not be generally known that the American Olympic Committee now has separate national committees, teams, and budgets for men's and women's swimming. The N. C. A. A. is represented only on the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee, and therefore should direct its chief efforts in swimming to the support of the men's teams. Since it appears that a considerable number of the best swimmers and some record holders of the United States are high school or preparatory school pupils, the Committee invites the active cooperation of institutions fostering interscholastic swimming in this important work of fund raising. It is estimated that about \$27,000.00 are needed for adequate representation of the United States in Olympic swimming, diving, and water polo. With the opposition against the Olympic Games, which has been so extensively subsidized by the particular interests involved, the task before us calls for immediate local, regional, and national cooperation from swimming coaches, swimmers, officials, and friends of swimming generally. It is urged that all institutions of the N. C. A. A. and the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, and preparatory schools having swimming pools or fostering swimming teams join in the fund raising activities by conducting at least one benefit performance. Water carnivals, development meets, sectional, preliminary Olympic tryouts, and the sale of flashads and Olympic buttons are suggested. Members of this Committee will be glad to provide suggested programs for such benefits and the necessary administrative procedures in conformity with the policies of the American Olympic Committee.

Harvard University provided the setting for the Twelfth Annual N. C. A. A. Swimming Championships last March 29 and 30. This meet surpassed all its predecessors in having 36 colleges and universities participating, with 142 entries, representing nearly every N. C. A. A. district of the United States. A detailed account of the meet was published in the N. C. A. A. News Bulletin of September 1935, and another account appeared in the 1936 Intercollegiate Swimming Guide published early in December. At the end of this report is submitted a detailed financial statement of the meet.

The Intercollegiate Swimming Guide, again edited by Ed Kennedy of Columbia, and published under the direction of Mr. Doyle of the American Sports Company, is well up to the standard of the best of other years. The Rules Committee congratulates the editor and the publisher, and takes pleasure in recommending this publication to the members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, libraries, and especially to coaches, swimmers, and officials of swimming meets in all parts of the United States. Educational institutions having teacher training courses are urged to see that prospective leaders in the field of swimming become acquainted with this annual publication.

This year's book contains four educational articles of unusual merit. Fred Cady, a member of our committee, is author of "Suggestions of Methods to be Used in Teaching the Fundamentals and Correct Execution of the Running $\frac{1}{2}$ Gainer, $1\frac{1}{2}$ Gainer, $1\frac{1}{2}$ Cutaway". It presents an analysis of the three most dangerous dives from the point of view of the problems of the learner, methods of teaching, and protection against injuries. In "Suggestions for Fancy Diving Judges", Ernst Brandsten of Stanford University, also a member of our committee, makes a qualitative analysis of diving performances generally, with helpful suggestions to judges of diving. Leon M. Prince, Jr. is the author of a valuable article on "Judging and Timing Today". This contribution should be most valuable to all who are conducting swimming meets, whether intercollegiate or intramural. He has developed an ingenious device for timing swimming races electrically. The final educational feature article, "Swimming Records", is by Philip S. Harburger of Columbia, chairman of our records committee. He defines records as the yard-sticks, the standards by which relative competitive swimming achievements are gauged, and explains in detail the various types of records kept and the administrative procedures for safe-guarding the validity and integrity of these standards. This sub-committee is setting up separate records for high schools and preparatory schools, as well as for colleges and universities, and coördinating our records with those of other national and international bodies.

The annual meeting of the Rules Committee was held at the time of the National Championships at Harvard. At the suggestion of the members themselves the final session consisted of

an all night meeting in order to cover a large docket of important matters. The Committee was aided in its deliberations by the official representative from the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations and by members of the Intercollegiate and Interscholastic Swimming Coaches Association of America. Every effort was made to meet the needs of swimmers, divers, and water polo players as presented by these representatives. According to reports made at that time and in recent communications, the rules are proving acceptable in all sections of the United States.

The Rules Committee acknowledges with sincere appreciation the most helpful assistance given in its work, and the chairman likewise is grateful for the faithful coöperation of the active and advisory members of the committee.

FINANCIAL REPORT

of the

TWELFTH ANNUAL NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SWIMMING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Harvard University, March 29-30, 1935

Receipts

Entry Fees	Paid	Balance Due
Amherst	\$4.00	
Army	1.00	
Bowdoin	11.00	
Brown	7.00	
Case	4.00	
Colgate	7.00	
Columbia	3.00	
Dartmouth	1.00	\$1.00
Duke	1.00	
Fordham	2.00	
Harvard	16.00	
Illinois	10.00	
Iowa	11.00	
Lafayette	2.00	
Loyola	1.00	
Massachusetts State	4.00	
Michigan State	5.00	
Michigan University	26.00	1.00
Minnesota	5.00	
M. I. T.	8.00	
Navy	10.00	1.00
Nebraska	2.00	
Northwestern	5.00	
Ohio State		8.00
Oklahoma	2.00	
Rochester	3.00	
Rutgers	7.00	
Southern California	4.00	
Springfield	9.00	
Stanford	1.00	
Trinity	2.00	

Washington University	1.00	1.00	
University of Washington	3.00		
Wesleyan	3.00		
Yale	31.00		
	\$215.00	\$12.00	\$227.00
Ticket Sale			
Friday, March 29			
Afternoon 510 admissions @ .50		\$255.00	
Evening 381 reserved seats @ \$1.50		571.50	
Saturday, March 30			
Afternoon 672 admissions @ .50		336.00	
Evening 874 reserved seats @ \$1.50		1,311.00	
			2,473.50
Programs			
1,173 sold (Fri. and Sat.) @ .14		\$164.22	164.22
Total			\$2,864.72
EXPENSES			
Ticket Sellers, Ticket Takers, and Ushers		\$148.30	
Labor		9.00	
Printing			
Applications	\$45.00		
Badges	5.50		
Cards (Timers' and Judges')	18.25		
Diving Charts (drafting)	10.19		
Diving Charts (printing)	2.75		
Diving Charts (blue prints)	7.45		
Entry Blanks	23.50		
Programs	142.00		
Tickets	27.50		
			282.14
Sales			33.20
Press Stand and Ladders		135.39	
Medals and Plaque		150.33	
Towels		26.52	
Postage		22.23	
Telegraph, Messenger Service		10.21	
Office Supplies and Stationery		20.42	
Total			\$941.72

Summary		
Total Receipts		\$2,864.72
Total Expenses		941.72
Net Receipts		\$1,923.00
Less: Contribution held out for 1936 Olympic Fund		169.13
Amount available for pro-ration		\$1,753.87

Total cost of railroad transportation of coaches and contestants, \$4,929.19. Percentage of refund, 35.097.

F. W. LUEHRING,
Chairman.

TRACK AND FIELD

The Committee met on June 8 at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, with members attending except Harry Hillman (1st district), and Dean Cromwell (8th district).

Changes in Rules

Qualifying In the weight events and in the broad jump the final round of trials has been reduced from four to three trials. The semi-final round of two trials in two session meets is still optional with the Games Committee.

Order of Competition Trials in alternating pairs have been discontinued. All competition in the weight events and in the broad jump is to be in flights. When the entry field is large it may be divided into flight groups of six to ten to avoid long delays between trials.

Hurdles—All specifications of base and weight of the official hurdle have been dropped. Any hurdle is now official which is of the proper height and width and has an overturning force of at least 8 pounds. The L-type hurdle is recommended. The entire Rule 29 has been rewritten.

Order of Events Separate orders are listed for outdoor college meets with and without trial heats.

Cross Country Running The scoring method for cross country races has been more clearly stated.

The Annual Meet

The Rules Committee again assisted the Games Committee for the annual N. C. A. A. championships by selecting the outstanding athletes to be guaranteed travel allowances to Berkeley. This was an extremely difficult task because the sum available (\$12,500) was sufficient for only about 120 athletes.

T. N. METCALF,
Chairman

WRESTLING

Annual Meet.

The Eighth Annual National Collegiate Wrestling Championships were held at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, on March 22nd and 23rd, 1935. The meet was conducted as a team and individual championship. There were forty-five more

contestants representing twelve more institutions than ever participated in any other annual meet conducted by this Association. From the standpoint of number of spectators, amount of gate receipts, and resulting refund to the visiting contestants and coaches, it was also the most successful meet held thus far

Team Scores.

1st Place	Oklahoma A. & M. College	36
2nd Place	Oklahoma University	18
3rd and 4th	Illinois	15
Places (Tie)	Indiana	15
5th and 6th	Lehigh	8
Places (Tie)	Penn State	8
7th and 8th	State University of Iowa	6
Places (Tie)	Southwestern Teachers—Oklahoma	6
9th and 10th	Cornell College—Iowa	5
Places (Tie)	Washington & Lee University	5
11th Place	Central Teachers—Oklahoma	4
12th Place	Northeastern Teachers—Oklahoma	3
13th Place	Virginia Military Institute	2
14th—15th	Columbia	1
16th and 17th	Haverford	1
Places (Tie)	Ohio State	1
	St. Lawrence	1

Twenty-five other institutions participated but scored no points.

Individual Winners.

118-lb. Class

1st Place	Peery	Oklahoma A. & M. College
2nd Place	Duffy	Indiana University
3rd Place	Ledbetter	Illinois University

126-lb. Class

1st Place	Flood	Oklahoma A. & M. College
2nd Place	Gott	Southwestern Teachers—Oklahoma
3rd Place	Pakutinsky	Illinois University

135-lb. Class

1st Place	Sisney	Oklahoma University
2nd Place	Rasor	Oklahoma A. & M. College
3rd Place	Hanks	Southwestern Teachers—Oklahoma

145-lb. Class

1st Place	Martin	Oklahoma University
2nd Place	Tomlinson	Central Teachers—Oklahoma
3rd Place	Mellvoy	Illinois University

155-lb. Class

1st Place	Lewis	Oklahoma A. & M. College
2nd Place	McGrath	Cornell College—Iowa
3rd Place	Kalpin	Oklahoma University

165-lb. Class

1st Place	Johnston	Penn State
2nd Place	Kielhorn	State University of Iowa
3rd Place	Robertson	Oklahoma University

175-lb. Class

1st Place	Silverstein	Illinois University
2nd Place	Ricks	Oklahoma A. & M. College
3rd Place	Nickerson	Southwestern Teachers—Oklahoma

Heavyweight

1st Place	McDaniel	Indiana University
2nd Place	Scohey	Lehigh University
3rd Place	Beman	Washington & Lee

Falls.

In determining the team championship, first places counted five points, second places three points and third places one point each. One point was added to the team score for each fall scored by a member of that team throughout the meet. The real aim of wrestling is to endeavor to pin the opponents shoulders to the mat, but many good wrestlers really make no effort to score falls and are content to win by decision. A study of the results of the 1935 National Collegiate Wrestling Championships brings out the interesting fact that there were sixty-three points earned by falls during the progress of this meet. This represents a total of nine points less than the total number of placement points for winning first, second, and third places in each of the eight weight-classes. This shows unusually aggressive wrestling, in view of the fact that nearly all of the contestants in this meet were winners or runners up in the various conference and wrestling association championships or winners of some ability from unattached institutions; therefore, one would expect in such a meet that the contestants would be very cautious in which case comparatively few falls would result.

Financial Statement.

Gross Gate Receipts	\$2,825.28
135 Entry Fees @ \$2.00	270.00
Total Receipts	\$3,095.28
Disbursements:	
Federal Tax on Gate Receipts (10% of \$2,825.28)	\$282.53
Contribution to American Olympic Wrestling Fund (5% of Gross Gate Receipts less Federal Tax)	127.14
Local Expenses:	
Medals and Trophies	\$169.47
Tickets, Advertising, and Postage	129.59
Extra Labor and Help in Office	66.10

Officials (2 Referees)	155.00	
Police, Ticket Sellers and Takers	94.00	
Luncheon to Visiting Coaches and Committee Members	42.00	
Printing programs, cards, etc.	113.25	769.41
Total		1,179.08
Balance for refund to visiting contestants and coaches	\$1,916.20	
Total cost of transportation of visiting contestants and coaches	\$2,835.41	
Percentage of refund		67.57%

In total amount and percentage of refund, this is the largest ever made to the visiting contestants and coaches, in spite of the fact that 5% of the net gate receipts was donated to the American Olympic Wrestling Fund.

Other detailed information concerning the 1935 National Collegiate Wrestling Meet will be found in a brief report in the *N. C. A. A. News Bulletin*, Volume III, No. 3, of September, 1935.

Meetings.

As usual, the National Collegiate Wrestling Rules Committee held a conference with the visiting college coaches, about fifty in number, to discuss proposed changes in the wrestling rules. The Committee also held numerous closed sessions for consideration of proposed changes in rules, but the Committee finally decided to make very few changes, and all of these were of a minor nature. The Committee did discuss thoroughly a number of proposed radical changes in the rules, but postponed final action until some later date.

The Wrestling Coaches Association held their Annual Meeting in connection with this Tournament, and re-elected the same officers for the coming year.

Reports from all sections of the country indicate a satisfactory development of intercollegiate and interscholastic wrestling, although some sections report that professional "rassling" is having a detrimental effect upon the amateur sport in spite of the fact that the two have little in common.

Meeting of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee.

The 1935 meeting of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee was held at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, in connection with the National Collegiate Wrestling Championships.

At this meeting, Mr. W. H. Thom, wrestling coach at the University of Indiana, was selected as American Olympic wrestling coach.

Mr. E. C. Gallagher, wrestling coach at Oklahoma A. & M. College, was named honorary coach in recognition of his many years of service in promoting amateur wrestling and developing candidates for the American Olympic wrestling team.

Mr. William Sheridan, wrestling coach at Lehigh University, was named alternate coach to serve in case Mr. Thom should be unable to do so.

The chairman of the National Collegiate Wrestling Rules Committee was named alternate manager for the team to serve in case of inability of the manager, Mr. C. W. Streit, Jr., to so act.

Instead of holding the final American Olympic Wrestling Tryouts shortly before the Olympic Games as heretofore, the Committee decided to hold these tryouts about the middle of April. This will be of great benefit to the undergraduate candidates for this team because it will allow all of the unsuccessful candidates to go ahead with their usual plans for summer work or recreation, where heretofore this has delayed this decision until a major part of the summer had passed. Another advantage to the colleges is that these earlier dates for the final tryouts will bring the meet within the regular college year and, therefore, will make it possible for colleges interested in conducting these tryouts to submit invitations for the meet, whereas, heretofore, the final tryouts have always come at a time when it was practically impossible for any college to manage the tryouts. In view of the fact that the large majority of the candidates for this team are college or ex-college wrestlers, it is logical that the tryouts should be held under college auspices.

Wrestling Guide.

Last spring Mr. G. M. Trautman tendered his resignation as editor of the National Collegiate Wrestling Guide, due to pressure of his regular duties. The resignation was reluctantly accepted by the Rules Committee. Mr. Trautman served in this capacity for many years, and developed the Guide from a very small and mediocre pamphlet into a most creditable publication. The Committee wishes to hereby express its hearty appreciation to Mr. Trautman for his contribution to the development of intercollegiate wrestling.

The chairman of the National Collegiate Wrestling Rules Committee is now serving as editor of the Guide.

R. G. CLAPP,
Chairman

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS TAX

This report is merely supplementary to those that have been made at previous meetings.

Two cases involving the admissions tax are now pending in the Federal courts, one in the Circuit Court of Appeals for Georgia, involving the University of Georgia, the other in the United States District Court for Iowa, involving the University of Iowa. The Georgia case was decided by the District Judge against the contentions of the University. The case is not likely to be particularly significant, for it involves procedural questions that will destroy much of the value of any ultimate decision. Indeed, it is likely that the case will be decided without a consideration of the constitutional problem. As to the Iowa case, similar observations may be made. At the hearing in Des Moines on the 19th and 20th of December 1935, the United States District Judge announced his then tentative view that the questions before him did not involve the constitutional one.

It is not unlikely that the basic question in which the member institutions are really interested will not be decided until litigation develops involving a state institution that has refused not merely to pay the tax, but to collect it from the ticket purchasers. At Iowa State College it is the understanding of the Committee that the tax has never been collected. So far as is known, the Government has taken no steps in that situation. At the University of Michigan this fall the tax was not collected, and the revenue officials have been urged to take prompt action against the University.

The members of the Committee by no means want to be understood as advising state institutions to follow the example of the University of Michigan. It is clear, however, that the more institutions that do refuse to collect the tax, the sooner the Federal authorities will be driven to face the fundamental issue in a suit that will really test the constitutionality of the tax.

RALPH W. AIGLER,
Chairman

RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING

The Secretary's report on a questionnaire conducted among the colleges on the subject of the Code on Recruiting and Subsidizing, adopted last year, will be found in Appendix II, pages 106-113.

ADDRESSES

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

MAJOR JOHN L. GRIFFITH

I would like to talk with you informally today, if I may, regarding some of the matters to which we are giving our attention at these meetings. Another year in college athletics is past.

We are meeting today, as has been our custom for thirty years, to review the events of the preceding months in college athletics, and to look ahead with the thought of doing what we can by way of serving the interests of the young men in the colleges and universities who are advanced for good or bad by their contact with, and participation in, college sports.

Your Executive Committee has held several meetings during the year, reports of which have been mailed to the member colleges. Our beloved and efficient Secretary, Dean Nicolson, has at different times mailed *Bulletins* to our members so that they may be kept informed regarding the work of the Association. Of course we all realize that a great deal of the Association work is done by committees. One hundred and seventy-six men have this past year labored as representatives of the N. C. A. A., as members of committees, or as officers of our organization. In addition to our regularly constituted rules and games committees, our men have been actively engaged in working on Olympic committees, as members of the Committee on Tax Legislation, the Committee on Eligibility, the committee that is collecting money among the colleges for the Olympic Games, etc. You will find a report of the work of these various committees in the 1935-36 Proceedings.

There is but little scientific evidence year after year on which to base any statement relative to progress being made in the administration of college athletics. On the material side there are data which show that the colleges have gained some of the ground which was lost in the earlier days of the depression. The colleges are in better financial condition to carry on their programs in physical education and athletics today than they were a year ago. This is largely because the attendance at the college games was greater by approximately 10% than the attendance at the games last year, consequently some of the activities which were curtailed in 1932 and 1933 have been given needed assistance. A surprisingly large number of assistants in the physical education and athletic departments were dismissed because of financial pressure a few years ago, and quite a large number of these positions have been again filled. There has been some

increase in the matter of construction of athletic buildings and improvement of athletic fields. We may view these signs of progress with gratification.

Regarding the question as to whether or not we have made progress this year on the ethical and spiritual side, there are conflicting opinions. No man can give a scientific answer to this question. It seems clear to me that, if we compare conditions that existed thirty years ago at the time when the N. C. A. A. came into existence with general conditions today, we may safely conclude that considerable progress has been made by the colleges in the administration of their athletic activities. In the first place, athletic relations are on a more friendly basis than they were thirty years ago. I turn to a book recently published by Mr. Carl D. Voltmer for a few references which may be pertinent to this discussion. We need, however, only to think back to the earlier days to assure ourselves that conditions are better today than they were then. Mr. Voltmer quotes from the *Purdue Exponent* back in 1895, in which the sports editor of that paper reported a baseball game played between Purdue and Wabash. The Purdue writer in speaking of the game said: "Their batting was weak, their base running stupid, and their knowledge of the game appalling. They can't stop a hungry government mule with a bale of hay, let alone a lively baseball." Wabash apparently was victorious in the game, because the writer later in his story adds, "The story is quickly told by saying Wabash used a professional pitcher of eight years' experience."

The following examples reported by Mr. Voltmer may be of further interest:

"The *Iowa Vidette-Reporter*, November 10, 1894, gives some details of a football game with Missouri. 'Several of the team (Iowa) say that during the trouble several persons in the crowd drew knives on the team.' The reporter concludes his play-by-play description: 'But here a slight altercation takes place between the M. S. U. center rush and our quarterback Bremner. It is impossible to give a detailed account of the game from this point, for your humble servant was a very busy man for the next seven minutes.' (And no great wonder either with the air so full of knives and high spirits.) 'The faculty and students of M. S. U. are not responsible for the actions of the scoundrels who assaulted our men, but certainly they should never again ask college men to play football in Columbia without a strong guard of armed men, without which no team seems to be safe on Columbia's grounds.'

"The *Daily Illini* (Illinois), 1896, p. 675, describes a Chicago game: 'At this point the game was stopped and out trotted Chicago's professional star . . . It was evident . . . the referee had determined Illinois should not score.' And later the paper states that the player mentioned above 'has been in athletics there since the institution opened. He will probably still be there when

Macaulay's *New Zealander* stands on the wreck of London Bridge and views the ruins of modern civilization."

Granting that we may take some of these articles written by undergraduates more than a quarter of a century ago with a grain of salt, yet these, of us who were connected with athletics at the turn of the century, I now will tell you, the relations between institutions and the relations between competing teams were not so friendly then as are similar relations today.

Further, while there is and probably always will be criticism of the officials, yet it seems to me that we have made some progress during the years as regards our attitude toward officials. There appeared in the *Lehigh Review* recently two accounts of a game played a good many years ago between Rutgers and Lehigh. Rutgers apparently lost the game and their reporter, after explaining how Lehigh scored in the game, said, "After this the decisions of the referee became positively rank, and as judgment after judgment was rendered the wearers of the Scarlet became more and more disheartened, played more and more listlessly, while the ball was gradually pushed nearer and nearer our goal. How such an epitome of brazenness and partiality in the guise of a referee could have been allowed to remain on the field after his very first decision passes human ken, but he was allowed, and the result was that football at Rutgers was practically killed for this year at least." The Lehigh reporter, however, thought that the Lehigh team was made up of fine men who played heroically and who won a well deserved victory. Is it not true that the attitude of players, coaches, and spectators toward officials today is considerably different from the attitude of the same groups a few years ago? I feel that this question can be answered in the affirmative.

It is not necessary to call attention to the eligibility rules that were or were not in force thirty years ago and to the eligibility rules that have been adopted by the leading colleges and universities of the present. The cynic may say that we now have eligibility rules but do not observe them, and that it is better to have no rules than to maintain the pretense of observing rules that have been adopted. History records that in the early days in England football was played between rival villages. Sometimes the villages were four or five miles apart. All of the able-bodied men and boys of the two rival towns participated in the fight, for it could hardly be called a game. In those contests everything was considered fair, and consequently fatalities were numerous. Every sensible person will agree, I am sure, that it is better to attempt to play according to the rules of the game, even though some may break the rules, than it is to play without rules. The fact is, it is generally recognized that we cannot have a good game without rules. Are our faculty eligibility committees more lax in enforcing eligibility rules today than they were five, ten, fifteen, and twenty years ago? The pessimist answers

"yes," and the optimist's answer is "no". Human nature does not change very much with the years, but this, I think, is true, that the college men who sign the eligibility blanks, generally speaking, are honest men, and if so the eligibility standards of the colleges of the country are for the most part honestly administered. In the earlier days in a good many of the institutions there were no eligibility committees. Eligibility standards were lower then than they are now, and, what is perhaps even more important, it was not formerly considered a serious offense if the eligibility rules were broken. Some people feel that there are sudden changes for the better or worse in college athletics. One college because of lax administration may drop from a higher to a lower plane, while at another institution the men responsible for athletics may insist that only the highest ethical standards shall be observed.

The men who today feel that college athletics are going from bad to worse are pretty much thinking in terms of the recruiting and subsidizing problem. Some college here or there plays mercenaries on its teams, and when the fact becomes known the suggestion is offered that college football men for the most part are hired by some means or other. I assume that we will all agree, without offering specific proof, that there is some cheating among certain colleges in the matter of hiring athletes, just as members of the medical profession would doubtless agree that some surgeons split fees in a way that is not considered ethical by the profession. The law associations are constantly waging war against the members of their profession who are classified as ambulance chasers. Trade associations among business men accept the fact that some corporation officers do not observe the business men's code of ethics. And the general public recognizes the fact that some politicians lie, make false promises, and squander the taxpayers' money. What I am trying to suggest is that we cannot indict a profession, or a business, and we cannot generalize from insufficient data in offering an appraisal regarding the present ethical standards, or lack of ethical standards, in college athletics.

Whether there are more hired athletes playing on college teams today than there were a few years ago or not, I am sure this is true, that college funds, including receipts from athletic games, are not being used to any great extent in paying players for so-called services rendered in athletics. It has been demonstrated that colleges and universities can maintain intercollegiate athletics on a non-paid-player basis. There are but few institutions of higher learning in this country the officers of which will openly champion the principle of hiring college athletes and paying them from university funds, or of encouraging others to pay them from private funds, however raised.

This question of competition is centuries old. The Spartans existed for a time under a non-competitive system. There for

the most part the idea prevailed that all men were equal, that one had as many possessions as the other, and that their sole purpose in life was that of serving the state. In Athens, on the other hand, the principle of competition was maintained. From the days of ancient Greece to the present time people have suggested substituting the non-competitive for the competitive system.

Since there always has been, and probably always will be, a certain amount of cheating in competition among colleges for good athletes, there are those who have been suggesting different ways by which men may be made honest in terms of athletic administration. First, there is the suggestion that college presidents, college faculty representatives, athletic directors, coaches, and alumni will cheat so long as admissions to the games are limited to those who pay for the privilege of witnessing the contests. Those who hold this view point out that in order to secure large sums of money by and through admissions it is necessary to have a winning team, and in order to secure a winning team it is essential that good players be persuaded to enroll in the college and to help put on the exhibition that will draw large numbers of spectators who will pay in great sums of money, so that the college authorities may be able to build and maintain an expensive plant and program for athletics. To those who are of this school of thought bigness and badness are correlative terms. Success cannot be attained by legitimate methods, according to this line of reasoning. In other words, the finger of suspicion must always point at the officers of the institution whose teams are successful, while those whose teams have suspicion.

This philosophy, if it may be called a philosophy, may judge that an American and un-American college has even won football games without paying the players. Business men have succeeded by playing the business game according to the rules, and success in America should not be considered a disgrace. I trust that we have not reached the time when we believe that the rules of the game can be changed so that only the incompetents can win. Competition is the law of life. If ambition is destroyed so as to prevent conflict, social stagnation would inevitably result. President George Barton Cutten suggests that "There must be the most relentless competition within the group if progress is to result We must have competition and competition without quarter if we are to advance. Intelligence should not be used to eliminate competition but to change its form. No longer murder and robbery as a form of competition, but improved methods."

Whether we like it or not, we are going to have competition in business, unless we wish to destroy the principles of liberty under which we have prospered spiritually and materially as has no other people in the history of the world. The colleges are going to compete for endowments, for desirable students, and

for good athletes. Unless, however, this competition is carried on with respect for the rules of competition, the results will be disastrous.

Our special committee last year suggested a code of fair competition for athletes. Apparently the majority of the conference groups are operating in accordance with the N. C. A. A. code, or under others that are just as good. Are we ready to admit that we cannot play the game according to the rules—eligibility rules—rules respecting competition for athletes—in the same fine way that the men on the teams compete according to the playing rules? The time has come, it seems to me, when we should spend less time talking about the system, and should devote more attention to our own conduct as it relates to athletic administration.

If you agree with me that we should decide first as to what are desirable practices in these respects, then the question is, what is the next step to be taken? In football the Rules Committee defines clipping. The officials rule as to whether or not clipping occurs in the game, and if a clipping foul is detected the officials exact the penalty which the Rules Committee has prescribed. Reasoning from that analogy, there are those who feel that the N. C. A. A. should adopt a hard and fast definition of legitimate and illegitimate recruiting and subsidizing, and, having done so, it should employ a corps of officials to police the colleges, with the thought that if fouls are committed some kind of a penalty should be enforced. The N. C. A. A. has through the years been opposed to this principle, because we have felt that lasting progress is attained by and through education, including moral education, rather than by legislation, coercion, and force. If the N. C. A. A. were to assume the responsibility of becoming a governing body, then local self-government would ultimately be a thing of the past. When the NRA came into being, trade associations began to pass out of existence. If the N. C. A. A. attempted to assume the responsibility of ordering the conduct of the colleges of this country, then the small, homogeneous groups called conferences would gradually become ineffective, and ultimately they would be destroyed. Those who would lessen the autonomy of the individual institutions and would pass the responsibility on to a strong centralized government of some sort are suggesting an easy method by which college men may be made honest. There are several things wrong with the suggestion, one of which is that such a procedure never produces the desired results. We are not going to shirk our individual responsibility as regards the administration of athletics, which means that the N. C. A. A. in my judgment is not going to attempt to become a governing body. What, then, can this Association do? We can go on in the future as we have been proceeding in the past, depending upon educational methods, urging that the colleges that do not maintain

teams composed of mercenaries compete with like institutions of like ideals. I trust that this coming year all of the organizations that are meeting here today will unitedly cooperate in a vigorous campaign of education designed to bring about a more healthy state of athletics among the colleges of the country. I hope that we may with increased vigor impress on the presidents, faculty athletic administrators, directors, and coaches the fact that the future of college athletics is in their hands.

Before I conclude these rambling remarks may I say a word about the coming Olympic Games. At the meeting of the Olympic Association following the games in Los Angeles, an invitation to the United States to participate in the games in Berlin was received. The matter was referred to the Olympic Committee. The committee before formally accepting the invitation requested the chairman of the Olympic Committee, Mr. Avery Brundage, to visit Germany and make an investigation of conditions affecting the games and to report to the committee for later action. Mr. Brundage made a thorough and painstaking investigation and reported at great length the result of his findings. The Olympic Committee thereupon voted unanimously to accept the invitation to participate in the games this coming summer. Since that time propaganda against our participation has been spread throughout the country, which undoubtedly will make the raising of the necessary funds this year exceedingly difficult. There are forty-two nations represented in the Olympic Federation. So far as I can learn, the United States is the only one of the competing nations in which questions have been raised regarding the propriety of sending teams to take part in the quadrennial games. It is my hope that this Association will at this meeting unqualifiedly and enthusiastically express its approval of the action that has been taken by the Olympic Committee, and that we may further pledge ourselves to cooperate to the fullest extent not only in making it possible for our college men to try out for the American teams, if they so desire, but also in the matter of raising adequate funds for sending our representatives to Berlin this summer.

ORIGINS AND RELATIONSHIPS
OF ATHLETICS, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND MEDICAL SERVICE
IN AMERICAN COLLEGES

DR. JOSEPH E. RAYCROFT, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Most of the men in this audience have doubtless read the book written some years ago by Dr. George Dorsey entitled "Why WE BEHAVE LIKE HUMAN BEINGS." If you have not seen this book, I suggest that you put it on your list to read. Dr. Dorsey was a very eminent anthropologist and a wise student of human nature; also he had a keen sense of humor which flavored his writings.

Dorsey's thesis might be stated as follows: "The ability to gain a real understanding of an individual rests on a knowledge of his family history and his own environment." This principle is sound in its application to the student, as every psychiatrist knows, and it is equally valid in the study of a social phenomenon or institution.

It certainly is true that any attempt to understand the significance and to evaluate the influence and services of the organizations with which the National Collegiate Athletic Association is so closely allied on this, its 30th birthday, is conditioned by a real knowledge and sympathetic understanding of the influences and purposes that brought them into being.

The search for information that is pertinent in this study does not carry one back to Homer, who is the favorite starting point for most studies of athletic histories, but it does extend into a period that ante-dates by a good many years the formal beginnings of the organizations that are gathered here today. Specifically, it takes us back to the middle of the last century.

Now it is obvious that any detailed discussion of the material involved would require a book or perhaps as many volumes as were needed for Professor Mitchell's report on the recent study of "Social Trends." Therefore, the limited time allotted to this paper permits only a brief discussion of the most significant factors that contribute to our understanding of the present situation.

There has always existed among Americans of whatever degree of education, a preoccupation and concern regarding matters of personal health. Further, it was a common conviction among educators that health was dependent upon physical exercise of some sort; but there was no provision made in colleges in the early days for either informal or directed exercise; so the students, left to their own devices, yielded to the urge that affects all English-speaking peoples and developed their own system of

sports and games. The inconsistency of the academic authorities is shown by the fact that, in spite of their general adherence to the principle that health was in large measure dependent upon exercise, they frowned upon games and contests which the boys enjoyed, possibly for the esoteric reason advanced by Gamaliel Bradford that "they had an instinctive sense that all amusement was frivolous, if not dangerous."

Meanwhile, students who were hurt or sick were left pretty much to their own resources. Faculties realized that there was much sickness and too many physical breakdowns among the students. They worried a good deal about this fact for years but did nothing effective to combat the underlying causes.

Then in the 1850's something happened in a number of colleges to bring about marked changes in a very short space of time. A catalytic influence that had never before found conditions favorable came into this situation with amazing effects on both faculty and students. There is no analogy in the whole history of college or university education to the changes in student life that took place in a relatively short period.

The first of these was the "Amherst Plan." President Stearns of Amherst had recommended repeatedly to his trustees that provision be made for the establishment of a university department which should have special responsibility for the physical welfare of the students. Finally a "department of hygiene and physical education" was established under the direction of a physician. Provision was made not only for the medical examination of students and for regular exercise, but also for the encouragement of recreative athletics and for the care of students when they were sick. This latter provision was phrased: "It is distinctly understood that the health of the students shall at all times be an object of his special watch, care and counsel." This department was established and a gymnasium built in the year 1860-61.

This represented the first medical department and the last one for many years which made provision for medical supervision, regular exercise, recreative sports, clinical service and supervision of intercollegiate athletics. (It is on record that in 1859 Amherst and Williams played what appears to be their first intercollegiate contest.)

The second feature was the epidemic of gymnasium building, which reminds one of the late lamented stadium building spree, and which within a couple of years saw gymnasiums made available at Amherst, Harvard, Princeton and Yale. With the exception of the one at Amherst, no provision was made for trained supervision and direction of student activities.

The third expression of this change was seen in the stimulus that was given to the students to develop new organizations. This organizing genius is regarded as a typical American trait, and the students found a wide field for the exercise of their

powers in the development and management of sports. This movement started slowly, but soon gained impetus, and the formal organization of sports was brought about in most of the colleges in the East.

Records of sports organizations vary in different periods before 1850 and in different institutions. In general, however, they point to the development in each institution of informal, loosely organized groups or teams among which there was a varying amount of competition. There was seldom any continuity from year to year either in the makeup of the groups, except in the case of class teams, or in the sports promoted.

Occasionally a rowing, cricket, baseball, or football squad demonstrated its superiority over the squads in college and looked abroad for new worlds to conquer. Thus the early extra-mural contests originated. At first these games were played with clubs or school teams in the immediate vicinity; then followed contests with other college teams. The dates of some of these early intercollegiate relations may interest you:

Rowing, Harvard—Yale, 1852

Baseball, Amherst—Williams, 1859

Princeton—Williams, 1864

Princeton—Yale, 1867 (sophomore teams, home and home)

Harvard—Princeton and Harvard—Yale, 1868.

The score in one of the baseball games listed above was 58-52, which suggests that track athletics may have been a development from baseball.

Football, Rutgers—Princeton, 1869

Princeton—Yale, 1873

Harvard—McGill, 1874

Harvard—Yale, 1875.

It is interesting to note that the first Oxford—Cambridge match in Rugby was played in 1872!

These contacts and contests with students of other institutions furnished an agreeable variation in the college life and were repeated as conditions and the faculty permitted. Gradually they caught the fancy and attention of most of the students, and furnished an objective and stimulus for better athletic organization and more consistent training. Intercollegiate relations for years were of the most friendly and hospitable nature. Sometimes the baseball umpire was invited to dinner after the game!

It is to be noted that previous to 1871, most, if not all, of the intercollegiate contests noted above were strictly undergraduate affairs and frequently the teams represented a class that had won the college championship. For example, the first Yale—Princeton game of baseball was played by the class teams of

70 They were arranged by acquaintances in different colleges who happened to have the same interests; generally they had behind them neither any organization of the particular sport, nor one representing the institution; they paid all their expenses out of their own pockets or with subscriptions from their fellow students or classmates, and the faculty had nothing to do with them except, sometimes, to give them permission to leave the campus for a game.

The first formal organization of a sport in a college occurred as early as 1852, when rowing organizations were set up at Harvard and Yale and functioned for a number of years. The records appear to indicate that there were baseball organizations set up a little later at Amherst, Princeton, and Williams. Although football was played by Princeton in the 60's, yet it was not until 1871 that a football association was formed there, and similar organizations appeared at Harvard and Yale a year later. The first *intercollegiate* association of a sport appears to have been formed by the rowing men in 1870. Then followed the track association in 1875 and the football association in 1876.

For a number of years the intramural and extramural sports progressed peacefully side by side, each contributing to the other. Ultimately, however, as enthusiasm for contests with other institutions increased, the interest in the intramural organizations grew less until the emphasis was transferred to the teams that represented the college in contests with other institutions and the "team" absorbed the available sport facilities and the interest of the students to such an extent that the intramural teams became practically extinct. The favorite intramural sport until relatively recent years was to sit on the bleachers and watch the "Varsity team practice."

These developments in intercollegiate sports gave rise to many problems, some of which are still loitering us. Financial questions were difficult both at home and in relation with other institutions; "eligibility" and "professionalism" had been added to the academic vocabulary; the formulation of football rules was a continuous and arduous process. In the early days difficulty in reaching an agreement as to the rules which would govern a given football game arose immediately after the arrangement for the game. The football rules that were used in one institution were frequently unwritten and varied more or less widely from those used in other colleges, so it was necessary before each game for the representatives of two institutions to agree upon the code to be used or, as often happened, to hammer out a new code which would govern the coming game.

The records are not entirely clear but it appears that the first rules conference involving more than two colleges was held by representatives of Rutgers, Princeton and Yale in New York in 1873, with the result that an agreement was arrived at to play teams with twenty men under "association" rules.

The second conference was held in Springfield by representatives of Harvard and Yale in 1875 and resulted in the formulation of a code called "concessionary rules" which included features of both association and rugby games.

The third conference was held in Springfield by representatives of Columbia, Harvard, Princeton and Yale in 1876 and resulted in organizing a loose form of "Intercollegiate Association" and the agreement to play teams of fifteen men under a code called "modified rugby."

Other conferences involving various colleges were held during the intervening years until the Intercollegiate Football Association disbanded in 1894, and the first "Football Rules Committee" was organized, composed of representatives of Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton and Yale.

In 1895 there was a split in this committee which resulted in two sets of rules, one used by Cornell, Harvard and Pennsylvania, and the other by Princeton and Yale. The following year these two committees, plus a representative of the Naval Academy, met in a joint session, with the result that representatives of these six institutions constituted the Football Rules Committee until 1905 when the National Collegiate Athletic Association was organized.

The conferences just listed were made up of students and alumni and dealt mainly with questions of rules and eligibility. Gradually other phases of these intercollegiate relations forced themselves upon the attention of college authorities, so that in 1884 a conference of faculty representatives of colleges in the Eastern and Middle States was brought together to discuss "athletic problems." Apparently this was the first of a long series of faculty athletic conferences. The general attitude of faculties toward athletics up to this time might be fairly described as one of more or less patient tolerance. When conditions developed that appeared to endanger the welfare of the students and the reputation of the institution, it changed to one of exasperation. These early conferences of faculty representatives were generally called to meet an emergency. There was no real continuity in their operations and little of permanent value came out of them, because the control of athletics was in the hands of alumni.

The first effective step toward the correction of this situation was the organization in 1895 of the conference of faculty representatives from several of the large institutions in the Middle West. Athletic organizations grew up with great rapidity in the Western colleges and were modeled upon those that had been developed in the Eastern institutions. The mistakes and weaknesses of Eastern organizations were adopted even more cordially than many of the better points. The situation became critical; relations among the institutions were strained. The result was the establishment of a permanent organization of representatives

of university faculties that took over complete control of the intercollegiate athletic activities. This progress of administration and supervision worked so well in the "Western Conference" that it was imitated in several other sections of the country. It is to be noted that these conferences operate in groups of closely related institutions. They are not national. Thus they are able to "control" to an extent that no "national" organization *can or should attempt* to do.

These regional conferences performed a most valuable service by improving relationships and methods of administration, but they could not correct the general football situation which was country-wide. Criticisms were voiced by individuals, the press and state legislatures, as well as by college faculties. Football was in danger of being outlawed as in the old days in England. This campaign became so intense and wide-spread that a conference of faculty representatives of nearly 70 institutions was brought together in December 1905 by the invitation of Chancellor McCracken of New York University. From the proceedings of this conference developed what is now the National Collegiate Athletic Association. There is no need to attempt to detail the splendid services of this organization, not only to football, but to all other intercollegiate sports during the past 30 years.

Meanwhile the leaven of the Amherst program of student welfare was slowly working, and in 1870 Princeton appointed George Goldie as its first physical director. He was a skilled acrobat and a famous athlete, holding the title of champion in the Caledonian games. He organized gymnastic classes, coached most of the teams then existing, and organized track athletics on an intramural basis in 1873; but there was no provision for medical examinations or for clinical service.

In 1879, Harvard built the Hemingway Gymnasium, which was the finest of its time, and appointed Dr. Sargent as director of the gymnasium. He followed Dr. Hitchcock in the development of an elaborate plan of physical measurements and examinations including strength tests. He conducted classes in gymnastic exercises. He had little to do with intercollegiate athletics of that time, and there was no clinical service for sick students.

Similar departments were developed in various institutions throughout the country, but none of them on the comprehensive basis represented by the Amherst plan. For many years it stood alone and merited the tribute of President Eliot when he stated that "it is to Amherst College that the colleges of the country are indebted for a demonstration of the proper mode of organizing a department of 'physical education'" (This term was used in its inclusive sense.)

It was not until 1891 and 1892 that Leland Stanford and the University of Chicago established a regular department in the University which had the responsibility for medical supervision

and clinical service for the students, the conduct of programs of physical exercise, and the coaching and supervision of athletic teams. Gradually, however, the number of institutions that had some provision for student health and physical education had increased, so that in 1897, when the College Directors organized a society, it had 23 charter members, and Dr. Hitchcock was elected the first President. All of these men except two were doctors of medicine; most of them had engaged in competitive athletics, and many of them had had experience in coaching athletic teams. This group, then, and its successors were admirably fitted to deal with problems of health, physical education and athletics. Dr. Edwin Fauver calls attention to the fact that "This group first promoted the idea of periodic medical examinations; special work to correct physical handicaps; developed tests for the measurement of physical vigor and condition; and to organize courses in personal hygiene."

They recognized the validity of the old idea that exercise and sports suited to the individual made a valuable contribution to health; but they went further and set up programs of graded activities and games that had for their objectives, in addition to health and vigor, body control and agility, alertness, emotional stability under stress and the habit of coöperation.

The ability and wide experience of these men and of those who joined the Society in later years enabled them to render valuable service in the work of organizing the National Collegiate Athletic Association and in the conduct of its administrative procedure ever since.

The recognition of the need and value of the clinical service performed by these doctors resulted in a rapid increase in the volume of work of this sort. Also there arose a tendency to appoint as physical directors men who had graduated from schools of physical training or men who were prominent athletes. Since these men were not medically trained, provision was made for clinical service in some institutions by the appointment of a college doctor.

The first college infirmary for the care of students was built at Princeton in 1892 as the result of the interest and contributions of alumni, ladies in the college community and parents of students. The second college hospital was built at Harvard about 1904.

Again there was a long period during which adequate provision was lacking in most colleges for the care of students who might be sick. In the meantime the interest and participation in intercollegiate athletics had grown with great rapidity and occupied a place of great importance in the college life.

This expansion in the intercollegiate field gave rise to a number of new and difficult problems, not the least of which was the increase in the number of serious injuries and disabilities that occurred among the members of the teams, especially football

Inasmuch as these athletic organizations were in most institutions practically independent of control by the college authorities, including the college doctors, the custom grew up of employing some doctor not connected with the college to attend to the medical needs of the team, generally football or crew. It is only fair to say that the students and young alumni who were in the main responsible for the promoting and guiding of this new college activity, and the relationships with other colleges, did a better job than is generally realized.

Even this provision, limited as it was, appeared in only a few institutions. In most cases "decisions that were most important from the point of view of the physical welfare of the student were made by coaches, trainers and rubbers, and were followed in many instances by serious infections or permanent physical handicaps of a serious nature." Also the absence of preliminary physical examinations for candidates of the teams made it possible for boys suffering from heart lesions, kidney weaknesses, etc., to take part in strenuous athletic contests. Further, the tendency in the modification of rules over a long period was to mobilize masses of men against a given point in the opposing team, which gave rise to many injuries. This, of course, has been corrected by the coöperation between coaches and rules committees; but even today the technique, strategy and tactics, of football especially, have advanced much more rapidly than have the provisions for the selection, training and medical treatment of the individual athlete.

As time went on these medical aspects of the situation became more obvious and the requirements of modern medical service in general examinations, direction of the physically sub-normal student, clinical care and service for athletic teams became heavier than even the medically trained physical director could satisfy in addition to his other duties. Therefore a medical staff has been built up in most of our larger institutions. Shortly after the war it appeared to some of the medical members of the College Directors' Society that this group of distinctly medical problems in our colleges and universities warranted more extended study and consideration than could be devoted to them in the general program of the Society. So, in 1920, the representatives of four or five institutions discussed the methods of setting up a new organization, called the Student Health Association, which would center its attention on this group of subjects. Twenty-five institutions were represented at the first meeting and there are now on the roll of members upwards of one hundred and forty institutions in which provision is made for medical examinations of all students, clinical service and special medical examinations, supervision and treatment of members of athletic teams.

During the past 15 years groups of coaches of football, basketball, track and swimming have set up organizations that serve

as special forums for the discussion of the problems incident to the teaching of these sports. The results of these conferences are frequently of value to the National Collegiate Rules Committees.

This account of the origins and relationships of the various organizations represented here is necessarily sketchy and lacks many significant details. It does however indicate the fact that each of them has been the result of the recognition of new needs and new conditions affecting the interests and physical welfare of students connected with the development of intercollegiate athletics and other conditions in college life; that each of them has a specific function to perform in this crowded picture; that becoming engrossed in the performance of its particular function each organization has tended to become sufficient to itself, to magnify the importance of its own contributions, and to lose sight of the fact that its function is in reality very closely related to that of other organizations.

It shows also that the physical director, the athletic coach, and the college physician are the legitimate children of the need to promote and protect the physical welfare of the student; and further that the strength and stability of all these organizations have depended largely upon the fact that a considerable group of men belong to two or more of these associations, and so serve as unifying influences among all of the organizations.

I trust that I have achieved some measure of success in my effort to throw light on a very complex situation. The multiplicity of organizations, built up with varying objectives and differing attitudes toward the activities and welfare of the student, and the variations in the methods and personnel of administration in different institutions, have gradually, in principle at least, been brought into essential agreement of purpose and procedure.

Each of the organizations represented here—Rules Committees, Coaches Associations, College Physicians, Physical Directors, Faculty Representatives, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association have, by intensive study of the problems of their particular fields, contributed to the solution of the central problem.

Finally, the real solution of this fundamental problem in its relation to the welfare of the individual can be reached by these organizations meeting here today only by coordinating the various services, supervisions, activities and sports in such a way that the student will profit from these contacts and experiences and will go out from college healthy in body, efficient in action, emotionally stable, and a good citizen.

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION, 1905-1935

GENERAL PALMER E. PIERCE, U. S. A. (RET'D),

HONORARY PRESIDENT

I have been asked to assist in this celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the N. C. A. A., by addressing you in regard to its formation, purposes, and methods. I am happy to do this, although it is realized that perhaps to some who have been interested in the effort since those hectic days of 1905, it may seem unnecessary and superfluous. If such be present, my apologies!

This organization resulted from a meeting called in the winter of 1905 by Dr. MacCracken, the chancellor of New York University. The purpose of the meeting was announced to be the consideration of certain abuses and excesses that had arisen in intercollegiate athletics.

The chief complaint was as to the playing rules for football. These rules were formulated up to that time by a self-perpetuating committee, of which Walter Camp of Yale was chairman, and representatives of Harvard, Princeton, Pennsylvania, Cornell, the Chicago Conference, and the Naval Academy were members. The demand for reform in the playing rules of football and the ethics of the sport was so great that 40 colleges sent delegates to this first meeting. They represented institutions of learning that were scattered from Maine to Texas, Colorado to Virginia.

It was no ordinary condition which caused such a gathering. The need for reform was patent to all. The press was filled with cries for it. The public demanded changes in the rules of play, otherwise the prohibition of the game by the state legislators.

When the great American public wants a thing, that thing usually comes to pass.

And so at the Murray Hill Hotel, Dec. 28th, 1905, there met the representatives of some 40 colleges. It soon became apparent that there were two groups present,—one that desired abolition of football, the other its reform and continuance.

I had been ordered by the Superintendent of the U. S. Military Academy to represent that national institution, and after careful consideration had drawn up a program of action, should it become apparent during the meeting that definite action for reform was desirable. After considerable discussion had taken place, it seemed to me advisable to present my plan. In doing so I stated that West Point desired football, that it believed the game especially suited for the training of candidates for commissions in the military service of the country, but that it was believed

desirable to take steps necessary for reform in the rules of play.

Therefore, I proposed that the assembly vote the continuance of the playing of football; that the rules of play be reformed so as to secure;—

- 1st. An open game.
- 2nd. Elimination of rough and brutal playing.
- 3rd. Definite and precise rules of play.
- 4th. Organization and control of officials in order that the rules made should be strictly and impartially enforced.

This program was adopted, and the following rules committee of seven members was elected;—Chairman, Dr. Harry L. Williams, University of Minnesota; members, Dr. James A. Balbitt, Haverford College, Mr. E. K. Hall, Dartmouth, Mr. C. W. Savage, Oberlin College, Professor James T. Lees, University of Nebraska, Lieutenant Charles D. Daly, U. S. Military Academy.

This body was instructed to get into touch with the old rules committee and endeavor to amalgamate their efforts. However, if not successful, the rules of play formed to accomplish the purposes set out above should be published and adopted by the colleges for the year 1906.

It was also voted to appoint a committee to draw up a Constitution and By-Laws of a permanent Intercollegiate Athletic Association. This committee consisted of Captain Palmer E. Pierce,—Chairman, and Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers, and Professor H. D. Wild, of Williams College, members.

This group held three meetings during 1906. The Constitution and By-Laws as drawn by them presented a practical scheme that might hope for success throughout the whole country. There was considerable discussion as to the adoption of definite eligibility rules. It was finally decided that the attempt was inadvisable, because of the widely diverse conditions that prevailed in various sections of the U. S. In some sections local associations and athletic unions were in existence with high standards and fine eligibility rules; in other parts of our land, there was little comprehension of the difference between an amateur and a professional. It therefore was decided to enunciate clearly the definition of an amateur in the Constitution, and give in the By-Laws a Code of Eligibility as a model for educational institutions.

The object of the proposed Association was stated to be "the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the U. S., in order that the athletic activities in the colleges and universities may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education".

Since then, there have been quite a number of changes in the Constitution and By-Laws, but this definition of the object of the organization remains the same to-day as when adopted 30 years

ago. It is believed to have had great influence on the administration of intercollegiate athletics by its members.

At the first meeting of the Association in 1906, Professor Bartlett, of Dartmouth, commended the Executive Committee for the tact and discretion which they had used in forming the Association and accomplishing a great work without creating any real antagonism. He declared there was already a higher amateur standard throughout the United States. He said that the remarkable amalgamation of the football rules committees marked a great triumph for the Association, which resulted not so much in the changing of the rules of play,—although in that respect a marked improvement has been made,—but even more, there had resulted a better public sentiment, a higher grade of officials, and in general a more sportsmanlike standard of fairness on the part of the players.

At that same meeting a letter from Mr. J. E. Sullivan, then president of the Amateur Athletic Union, was read, criticising the lack of a national organization of the colleges and stating that one should be formed and allied with the Amateur Athletic Union:—

- 1st. To define an amateur
- 2nd. To make eligibility rules.
- 3rd. To make uniform athletic laws.
- 4th. To pass on college records.

He wrote: "Such an Association will be built; it has got to be built; and the Amateur Athletic Union, through the college representatives now on the Board, must work for such an Association."

The happy result of all these favorable opinions and omens was that the organization that began its career in 1905-1906, with a membership of about 30, has now grown so that all the colleges and universities of any importance in the U. S. belong to it. But this large increase did not occur without much struggle and labor. In 1906 not one of the large universities had joined. In 1907, the University of Chicago became a member. In 1909, Harvard joined. And now all are members of this great educational Association.

The Association in 1907 voted that basket ball be recognized as a college sport and that it be controlled and safeguarded as other intercollegiate games. Therefore a Basket Ball Rules Committee was elected for the year 1908, and this practice has continued until the present.

During the annual meeting in 1908, Dr. MacCracken spoke of his regret that he had been unable to meet with the Association since the first meeting. He said he had called the meeting in 1905, due to the great agitation against football. He continued: "The three years since have shown great results. The game of football has been reformed. The entire work of athletics has

been lifted to a higher plane. This convention is absolutely the only national body organized to include all the universities and colleges of the United States. The object for which we meet justifies this Association, because it is the highest object. It is an *ethical* object. The preamble to our Constitution declares that we aim to maintain our athletic activities 'on an ethical plane'. When those activities of a young man which most fix his attention, excite his ambitions, and stir his feelings are kept on a high moral plane, *then a great deal is done towards making his a life of morality.*"

The Constitution stated that: "The colleges and universities enrolled in this Association severally agree to take control of student athletic sports, as far as may be necessary, to maintain in them a high standard of personal honor, eligibility, and fair play, and to remedy whatever abuses may exist". Thus was established the principle of home rule in the control and direction of competitive sports. The reforms to be accomplished should result from educational processes rather than from coercion. This rule has continued and, I believe, has justified itself. Of course there are still many things of an objectionable nature existing in college competitive sports. However, the fight against them is waged from day to day. If Dr. MacCracken were living now, he would marvel at the further advances that have been made since he spoke to us in 1908.

The field of operation of the Association has expanded prodigiously. It now provides rules for association football, as well as for the old American game, basket ball, swimming, track, wrestling, volley ball, boxing, lacrosse, and ice hockey. It has encouraged the formation of various associations of coaches. It has insisted on proper representation and responsibility in the Olympic Games and in various competitive sports events in which undergraduates participate. It has proven itself a useful and beneficial agent for the upbuilding of a healthy, useful citizenry.

THE COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT C. L. BREWER, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

The College Physical Education Association was formed thirty-nine years ago. So in years it is the oldest of the four associations meeting here. It has approximately 200 members in 91 institutions in 31 states. It has four charter members still active, and more than a score of men who have been carrying on with the organization for twenty-five years. So I believe there must be something holding in its influence.

In brief, it fits in with the work of the other three associations. I believe no one can carry on alone. I believe we four together can do a better job. The men of the College Physical Education Association, through its committees and its individuals and through its publications, are trying to standardize and evaluate and lift the program in physical education so it will make a more genuine and rich contribution.

The men of the College Physical Education Association probably come in contact with more students than the men of any of these other associations, and I believe have a rare opportunity to carry on and to assist the work that is being done by the other three.

THE AMERICAN STUDENT HEALTH ASSOCIATION

DR. W. E. FORSYTH, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

These joint meetings of our several organizations are most significant and of great possible benefit to our college students. I hope they indicate a growing future close relationship, to be promoted with student welfare clearly in mind.

I judge that we all recognize Amherst College as having inaugurated 75 years ago the first coördinated college Department of Physical Education and Hygiene. President Stearns had student welfare clearly in mind when he urged the program to correct a deplorable condition of student ill-health. His plan resulted in the erection of a gymnasium and the operation of a unified program of these several interests in a manner which might well serve as a model in many colleges today.

Our era of specialization has, alas, tended to cause us to forget that a college student is a single, total individual, and not a collection of unrelated organs, functions, skills, interests, attitudes, and ideals. With these growing specializations the parent Department of Physical Education appears to have become many-headed. Persons interested in certain phases of student welfare characterized by the word health organized, at the suggestion of Dr. John Sundwall, fifteen years ago, the American Student Health Association.

The Association has carried out a modest program of interest to an institutional membership of well over one hundred. While usually identified with the treatment of student illness, the leaders of the Association are coming to see increasingly the relatively greater importance of disease prevention and health education as its proper function in colleges. This emphasis upon health education calls anew for coöperation upon the part of coaches and leaders of student physical activities. These leaders hold student interest and sympathy to an unusual degree, and should in our judgment use their many golden opportunities to promote ideals, practices, and attitudes of health science, so genuinely related to student present and future welfare. Scientific teaching in the student clinic and hygiene class-room should be observed and practised particularly throughout the student physical education and athletic programs. There are altogether too many instances where this is not done.

The college physician sees a certain amount of futility in teaching the dangers of the common drinking cup when he observes the spectacular use of a common dipper, the single bottle, the favorite sponge, or a common towel before many thousands of admiring and interested college people. The teacher of hygiene takes considerable time in showing the amount of training needed to enable the physician to handle properly the difficult problems of disease and injury. Then he wonders what the students think when they see their heroes, the athletes, treated by the use of patent medicines, quacks, and persons of little or no proper training. The college physician is of course greatly encouraged to find his hand upheld by the use of scientific methods by those in charge of these student activity programs. The newly developing interest in mental hygiene offers to the leaders of student physical activities a splendid chance to promote the welfare of college students in a manner worthy of the institutions in which they work.

The Student Health Association has intentionally included in its programs many papers dealing with the health problems of physical activity, and it has agreed upon resolutions of this nature. It has fostered a National Conference on College Hygiene. It is to participate in another to be held in Washington, D. C., one year from now. The people in physical education who can render such important service in this broad phase of student welfare will be most welcome, and are urged to participate in this coming conference.

May I close, as I began, with a hearty approval of this joint program, and express the judgment that college students will be greatly benefited in the future by closer coöperation and better recognition of common aims in student service by our several specialized groups.

THE AMERICAN FOOTBALL COACHES ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT B. W. BIERMAN

The American Football Coaches Association was formed due to the foresight and enthusiasm of Major Charles Daly, a prominent coach and former gridiron star. He called a meeting of friends in the coaching profession at the Astor Hotel in New York on December 27, 1921, to discuss the feasibility of a permanent organization. Major Daly was made chairman at this meeting, and he outlined briefly the necessity of such an organization, and stated that his idea of forming such an organization was two-fold: first, to establish an organization through which the coaching fraternity as a whole could give expression to its views on the game; second, to bring all coach together with a view to mutual good fellowship and its attendant advantages.

All interested coaches were invited to a meeting held in the Hotel Astor, December 7, 1922, and a permanent organization became a reality with the following men as officers:

President—Major Charles Daly, U. S. Military Academy
 Vice President—John Heisman, University of Pennsylvania
 Secretary-Treasurer—Dr. J. W. Wilce, Ohio State
 Trustees—K. T. Fisher, Harvard
 Fielding H. Yost, Michigan

Meetings have been held annually since that time.

According to the constitution, the objects of the Association are:

1. To help maintain the highest possible standards in football and the football coaching profession.
2. To discuss matters of mutual interest.
3. To submit to the proper organization suggestions for the improvement of football.
4. To discuss various phases of football.
5. To place at the disposal of coaches sources of football information.
6. To work together for the improvement of conditions in American football.
7. To have a representative group of football men in which football problems of general interest may be discussed, and to which they may be referred for the friendly interchange of ideas.
8. Good fellowship and social contact.

There are three classes of membership, active, allied, and honorary.

Active Members

Coaches from colleges requiring 14 Carnegie units for entrance, and who are actively engaged (or directly associated with) the profession of football coaching and who have been so engaged for a period of three years, and who are otherwise acceptable to the organization, shall be eligible for active membership, and each member shall have the privilege of one vote.

Allied Membership

Any individual who has been associated with coaching football in an institution of learning is eligible. Allied members have the privilege of the floor, but are not entitled to vote.

The organization has had a continual growth, both in membership and in activities, since its beginning. Mr. W. H. Cowell, of the University of New Hampshire, who has been very active in the organization since its beginning, and who is a past president, has been secretary-treasurer continuously since 1930, and much of the credit for the development of the Association must go to him.

The membership now is 218 active, 333 allied, and 12 honorary members. The Association has made a good start in carrying out its objectives, but it is just growing into vigorous manhood, and can be of real service to school and college football and to the football coaching profession in the future.

It would take more than my allotted time to tell of all its activities. As in all organizations, much of the work is done by committees. The Committee on Football Injuries and Fatalities, under the chairmanship of Dr. Marvin A. Stevens, has done, and is continuing to do, an outstanding piece of work.

The Committee on Football Rules, headed by Lou Little of Columbia, has done outstanding work in collecting, analyzing, and studying the coaches' opinions regarding rules.

Much has been done toward building up of a coaching code of ethics.

Our organization is closely associated with the N. C. A. A., and the other organizations here, and we are happy to join with you in this joint meeting.

APPENDIX I

ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

THE RELATION OF PHYSICAL AND HEALTH ACTIVITIES TO THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

The Round Table Conference of the Thirtieth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened on Friday morning, December 27, 1935, at ten forty-five o'clock at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York, Dean E. L. Mercer, of the University of Pennsylvania, presiding.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: I hope that in this Round Table, the topic of which is suited not only to the small colleges, but also to the large universities, the small colleges represented here today will feel free to participate in this discussion. I think the large institutions can learn much from them in regard to the relationships of health and physical activities to the academic program.

I have been asked to conduct this annual National Collegiate Round Table. This is the first time such a topic has been placed before the Association for open discussion. Our topic "The Relation of Health and Physical Activities to the Academic Program" is a very broad and comprehensive one. It was so designed because we want to try to show how and to what extent health and physical activities have, in our member institutions, become correlated with one another and related to the academic program or become a part of it.

Though this Association is primarily concerned with the problems of intercollegiate athletics, it goes without saying that allied activities, such as the programs of student health, intra-mural athletics, and regular required service courses in physical education, bear an intimate relationship to one another and to intercollegiate sport, and must therefore be given a place in this discussion.

No matter what the relationships may be today in our separate institutions, we are all striving toward a common objective in our departments having to do with physical and health activities.

This objective may be expressed in three broad topics:

1. The preservation of the health and physical efficiency of our students
2. Teaching leading toward improved muscle training and the acquisition of physical skills
3. Character training and discipline so essential to proper social relationships of intercollegiate sports.

In other words our greatest interest should center around the effect of health and physical activities relationships upon the boys who are going through our universities and colleges.

Our discussion, this morning, it seems to me should stimulate all of us to analyze, in our own institutions during the coming year, those influences which are retarding or promoting the kind of internal relationships which tend to preserve or improve the general tone of intercollegiate sport.

Major Griffith through this Association has repeatedly urged the membership to guard constantly against the inroads of illegal recruiting and subsidization. Last year this round table period was for the open discussion of this topic. Certain broad principles of guidance were adopted and circulated. To-day we are approaching another topic which in the minds of your executive committee is the next step in the chain of

thought to lend strength to existing programs involving health and physical education activities. Certainly a close and genuine relationship of these activities with the academic side of our institutions will do much to offset the recognized harmful effects of subsidization, which we must admit is not decreasing to-day.

If the officers of admission are only accepting those school boys who are thoroughly prepared to undertake college work, and the requirements of work on the academic side are uniform and honest, and those serving physical education and athletic departments are in accord with the academic ideals and life of the colleges they represent, will not our individual problems be more easily solved?

Are we not too much guided and influenced by what is found in the printed eligibility codes of conferences and institutions, the contents of which our faculties do not wholeheartedly support? Should we not examine the time and energy demands upon athletes by coaches who think little of the students' academic obligations? Would it mean that in some institutions athletes are being favored in the classroom to compensate for the time they spend on the athletic field? Should institutions so plan the academic work as to allow for a recreational period of all undergraduates at a given time each day?

I have cited the above questions in the hope that you may feel inclined to discuss some of them informally this morning.

In conference with Dean Nicolson and Major Griffith, I received the information that the annual Round Table should be kept as informal as possible. I have overstepped the bounds a little bit in asking my very good friend and predecessor, Dr. McKenzie, to present to us this morning a short paper which may help in the beginning of this discussion.

To those of you who are new in National Collegiate circles, I want to introduce Dr. McKenzie. To those of you who have been here many years, he needs no introduction. He has been active in National Collegiate Athletic Association business ever since its inception, on its committees, serving as chairman of the Boxing Rules Committee and other committees, and has appeared on the program on various occasions. He is a charter member of the College Physical Directors' Association, and served it as president a few years ago. From 1904 until 1932 he headed the Department of Physical Education at the University of Pennsylvania, where a four-year program of required work has been constantly maintained. So it gives me a great deal of pleasure this morning to ask Dr. McKenzie to speak to us from the standpoint of the required program.

DR. MCKENZIE: The National Collegiate Athletic Association has always fought consistently and persistently for university control over the athletic sports of its students; for the teaching and direction of them by instructors who speak the language of university life rather than that of the hotel lobby or the gambling joint. It has striven to curb those practices that have always been with us that make for dishonesty and hypocrisy in college sport.

The College Physical Education Society for the past thirty years and more has carried on a campaign for the recognition of their work by the college faculty, and the placing of it on an equality with other required subjects of the curriculum.

From such separate viewpoints, these two most powerful influences for good in college life have converged, until their united attack has met and in many cases routed the common foes of vested commercial interests, faculty opposition, and the loose thinking and sometimes deliberate misunderstanding of writers who should have known better.

The joint campaign has had its victories and its setbacks and will go on so long as colleges insist on the ethical and educational standards that give them their reason for existence; but it may be said truly that both objectives which were at first looked upon as daring and doubtful experi-

ments are now generally accepted. The teaching and financial management of athletic sports have been combined with the health supervision and physical education of the student body, forming one comprehensive department under various names in a constantly increasing number of colleges.

As one who has been in the thick of this campaign for the last thirty years, and as one who has had the direction of a department in a university where the physical education of its students throughout their four years of undergraduate life has had recognition on the curriculum from the beginning, with grades, honors, and penalties that this implies; and as one who has seen the inauguration three years ago of a complete and comprehensive department such as I have described and as one who has watched its functioning to the present hour, I am glad to have this opportunity, the last I will have of meeting this group of old friends, of placing before you some of the conclusions that this long experience has forced upon me; and perhaps of making some suggestions as to how present problems may be solved if the good work already done is to be consolidated.

Our platform has been that physical education should rank equally with other subjects on the college curriculum.

In practically all American colleges, certain fundamental subjects are required of all students. It should be among them. It should have grades, honors, and penalties comparable with other academic subjects.

In order to clear the air, let me define what I mean by physical education so that we all may be talking about the same thing.

Physical education should include the teaching of exercises for the body all the way from prescribed movements for handicapped individuals right up to the coaching of teams for the most strenuous intercollegiate competition.

No hard and fast line divides them, although these two extremes differ so widely. Groups insensibly merge into one another, and there are startling exceptions all along the line.

I have seen a cripple win an intercollegiate swimming title; and it is not infrequent to see a man with a university letter proudly displayed on his chest who could by no stretch of imagination be called well educated physically.

One of the reasons why the recognition of this subject has so often stuck in the academic throat has been because it differs from most of the subjects taught by the university professor in its comprehensiveness and in its three-fold purpose.

The mission of physical education is not so much to give the students a knowledge of certain facts as to teach him:—

- (1) To preserve his health and physical efficiency
- (2) To learn certain muscular skills.
- (3) To conduct himself like a gentleman in the social relationships of competitive games

The work of a department will be successful just in proportion as it solves these three problems.

The entering freshman class from our standpoint as physical educators is an amorphous mass; and they have to be sorted out and graded by a physical examination medical in character, first, into the fit and the unfit.

In other college examinations, the unfit pass out of the picture. Not so with us. Most of them still go on and must be provided for.

The underweight freshman with tubercular history is not rejected as he would be in the army; but he needs advice and close supervision. The crippled heart, the defective senses have to be taken into account, corrected when possible, and directed in physical habits that will build them up or insure them against further injury. A man with a valvular heart lesion can become an expert rifle-shot without danger; and infantile paralysis need not keep its victim from the swimming pool. They may

even be graded in their program in a way quite comparable to the student in history or mathematics.

The main mass of students who are physically fit for any ordinary course of exercise fall into two fairly well defined classes:

- (1) Those who are athletically minded, who are ambitious to excel in athletic sports and games.
- (2) Those whose attitude varies from indifference to distaste and active opposition.

It is here that the real work of the physical educator begins, and it is also here that a requirement is necessary to secure and enforce the examination of their ability to perform certain physical feats, running, jumping, climbing, judgment of direction, distance and speed of balls like the foot ball, base ball, basket ball, volley ball.

This examination should and can be conducted in classes and must be simple. If it takes too much time it will fall of its own weight and will not be carried out, excellent as the plan may be.

Standards of performance have already been determined and are available, and they should be set so that about 50% of the students examined will pass and the other 50% will fail. Those who pass may go on to higher things and be given a wider selection of what they should do, but the "dubs" should be taught until they can pass them; and this will always be the hardest and least spectacular work of the department, for this teaching of skills must be gymnastic in character.

The word "gymnastics" is to some a fighting word. It arouses immediate opposition; but let us examine it a moment before giving judgment.

The boxer in preparing for a fight punches the bag; he shadow-boxes, he practices certain leads and counters again and again in order to perfect his speed and coordination. These are gymnastic exercises.

A good coach of a basket-ball team puts his squad through graded progressive instruction in dribbling, pivoting, goal-shooting, and passing. These exercises are gymnastic drills, and can be and are done in classes, where students learn the behavior of the basket ball, in the hand, in the air, or against the floor. The wrestler bridges to strengthen his neck. The runner stretches his ham-strings to give him ease in clearing the hurdle.

And so gymnastic drills for the teaching of elementary skills must be so arranged as to have a practical application, such as exercises of stretching, dodging, of speed, agility, and the teaching of definite feats requiring skill, like rope-climbing and ball games; and owing to the numbers involved, they will have to be done in classes; and the handling of these classes requires skilled and intelligent teaching.

Examinations in their ability to do these exercises from time to time give a definite objective for the student to work for and enable the teacher to grade them in a way which is quite comparable with the grading in other academic subjects. The teacher's success will be in proportion to his ability to analyze games, sports, gymnastic and acrobatic exercises in such a way as to awaken the student's interest in them; but whether the student is enthusiastic or not, he learns to do certain things that he ought to know. A man may try to get out of learning to swim, and many do, but when he has learned to swim, at least he can swim.

All teaching, from the simplest exercises to the most complicated coaching of a team, is "gymnastic" in character according to the correct definition of the term.

Why is this not easy to carry out? Well, it is like a sugar-coated pill. It looks attractive on casual inspection, but the pill must be there and that pill, which the student often wants to spit out in disgust, is discipline.

If there is one thing we need more than another it is the ability to drive ourselves to do the hard or disagreeable thing because it is the best and the right thing to do—to see the ultimate gain rather than the immediate

loss of comfort or ease; and as educators we are too often apt to take the easy way: to accept the plausible excuse; to condone the sloppy performance; to evade the irksome insistence on learning the difficult feat; to shirk the teaching of the student to overcome his own inertia or fear; in other words, to evade that insistence on discipline without which no education worth while can be made effective.

The average student will not voluntarily undertake many things that he should do, and the teacher must be his inspiration and sometimes even his back-bone; and he cannot evade his responsibility.

You will remember the man with the trained dog.

"This dog will do anything that I tell him to do", he explained. "Sit up and beg!" Whereupon the dog crawled under the sofa. "Very well, then crawl under the sofa! You see, he does anything I tell him to do!" Some teachers are like that. To throw a basketball out on the floor and let the students scramble for it is not the work of an educator. Such a teacher is not even a good attendant.

If physical education degenerates to the point where the teacher only takes the roll and keeps order, he descends to the level of a policeman and not a teacher. Any husky clerk could do this, and one cannot but sympathize with the harassed president of an institution who feels that he can help to balance his budget by discharging the members of such a department and substituting much less expensive care-takers who would be quite as competent to carry out such a program.

And now, in closing, let me leave this as my last message and belief, the conclusions of a lifetime spent in thoughtful study and active practice in its administration, for I will not again have the chance of addressing this group of combined workers in the field of physical education and athletics.

Docility and regularity of attendance are not enough to qualify a student for credit in physical education, nor is it enough for a coach to spend his time and energy in securing ready-made material for his teams instead of developing skill in the students that are already under his care.

We must show progress in actual teaching all the way from the supervised work of the defective through the mass of the indifferent and non-athletic up to the skilled coaching of the men who represent their college in intercollegiate competition.

Unless we can do this we have no right to a place at the academic fireside.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: Gentlemen, this completes the formal part of this program. Now the thing is wide open for you to take in your own hands and play with it in whatever way you wish. As I said before, this is a very broad topic. Dr. McKenzie has stressed the points dealing with the actual union of physical education to our college curriculum. In many of our institutions, however, this is not the situation, and there is a wide gap in the relationships between our athletic and physical activities program and the academic program. I suppose that we should discuss some of the points which are involved in that so-called divorce or separation.

I have tried in the remarks which I made in the beginning to produce some provocative topics for discussion this morning, but I should be glad to have you present any topics which you care to bring up yourselves. I am pleased to see there are so many men from the academic side of our institutions here this morning, and I hope that they will tell us, who are involved in the health and physical education side, something that they have on their minds.

I know in my dealings with faculty people there are certain reservations regarding the athletic and physical education staff, and this is a good time to air these thoughts. Is there anyone who cares to start off this discussion? I have written down a lot of names as I have looked over the audience. There are a great many faces I recognize, but I cannot place the names with them. I am going to call on some people in the audience.

Dr. Raycroft, I put your name down first, because I know you have a very definite attitude toward what our relationship should be with the college boy. I have heard you talk in private and I should like to have this audience hear you say something about it.

DR. JOSEPH E. RAYCROFT (Princeton University): Dr. Mercer has taken rather an unfair advantage of me, because he knows that I am more or less full of this subject, and I hope to get rid of a good many of my ideas this afternoon. This is not, I think, the place where I want to spend any particular amount of time in discussing so important a topic as this.

It goes without saying that I agree most heartily with everything that my friend, Dr. McKenzie, has just told you. I doubt very much whether repetition or discussion of the points which he raised would add anything in your minds to your understanding of the subject.

It is true, I think, to discuss one point which he raised, that the physical director has tended in the past fifteen or twenty years to lose sight of his main objective. I think that this is due in part, at least (and this is said without any sense of criticism, but as a statement of historical fact), to the fact that the appointments to this position in many of our institutions have been made from men who have made reputations honestly—well-earned reputations—as coaches of competitive teams, but who in connection with this work have not gained that broad view of the subject which Dr. McKenzie has outlined.

It may appear a bit harsh, but I think it is true when I suggest that in some of the extreme cases of this sort, so far as physical education is concerned, the physical educator might just as well be a playground director. He fulfills a function that is in many respects not superior to that occupied and performed by the playground director.

There is a very great need among all of our colleges for the development and installation of men who have this broader idea which has been outlined by Dr. McKenzie, who not only are skilled teachers and performers in their field, but who also understand the relationship which their work, their particular phase of work, bears to that general program which affects the welfare of the undergraduate student.

I think that represents fairly clearly in outline the feeling that I have on this topic after nearly as many years of experience as Dr. McKenzie.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: In order to put this matter before you and to see if someone will respond to one of my questions, I would like to raise a question which has been brought to me by many people through the past few years in regard to our relationships with admissions officers, with deans of our various colleges and schools in our universities. Frequently these officers tell me that people interested in the intercollegiate athletic phase of our institutional life are prone to come to them on bended knee to foster the interest of a particular boy who is knocking at the door for admission, and asking for privileges for him in the matter of admission or of classwork which they themselves do not ask of the dean or the admissions officer for a man who has not athletic promise. That in itself, in their minds, in a way destroys the confidence between these higher officers of our institutions and the people in the departments of health and physical education. I am very hopeful that some of you men who are here today, who are on that side of the picture, that is, who are serving our institutions either as faculty members of athletic committees, deans of our departments, or admissions officers, will give us some discussion on this topic.

I think our discussion is going to be very much better if we can have some volunteers from the floor. I should be very happy if someone would take the floor of his own accord and express himself as he sees fit.

DEAN T. A. DISTLER (Lafayette College): I notice in the *Herald Tribune* this morning a list of a great many people who were formerly

coaches and directors, but are now practically all professors, so that we now deal with them on the professorial level. I doubt, however, whether in changing the title we change the very thing Dr. Raycroft was talking about. It seems to me the most important factor is the individual himself and his philosophy and approach to the situation. I do not want to interject a discordant note, but I am very much afraid that the professional physical educators who apply for positions, with Ph.D.'s from schools of physical education throughout the land, very frequently lack something that you occasionally get in the professional coach with the right point of view. You get an overabundance, just as you frequently get with other school of education trained people, of methodology, but in most cases a great lack of personality and drive and force and character which you want to transmit to young people. I do think it is a mistake to have your athletic organization governed by a person who has the professional coach's point of view of competitive sports. I think we should be looking more for the character and personality and philosophy behind the man whom we select than as to whether he happens to be a medical doctor, or have a Ph.D. from some school of education in physical training, or is a professional coach. I think the important thing is the character and personality of the individuality.

The second problem about which you spoke, I think, is a fairly simple one for solution. I think in colleges and universities where our athletic people, whether they be physical educators or coaches or all on the faculty staff, are privileged to attend faculty meetings, they are entitled to receive, and do receive, information about students just as any other professor or adviser does. The point that you raised is quite foreign to a group of us who are deans of colleges and meet once a year to discuss our problems. It is quite foreign to us to have a coach come and make any kind of a plea about a student's academic standing or admission, because there is a very definite policy that there are certain admissions requirements which every student meets, regardless of whether he is a tackle or a zither player, and there are certain academic standards which every student meets.

It does not make a bit of difference; I think that is understood in most institutions; at least I have never been connected with an institution where I ever had, either as director of admissions, which I was for some years ago, or as dean, a coach approach me either to get a boy in who was not eligible, or to have a boy who was low in scholarship made eligible in order to play a game. I am inclined to think that in most of our institutions, certainly in the East, in our smaller institutions, it is not a problem at all.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: Does anyone else care to speak?

PROFESSOR UPDEGRAFF (University of Iowa): It seems to me that the question raised this morning has an answer which you should not permit anyone to doubt. It seems to me that the physical education program and the intercollegiate competition program constitute as a matter of fact but one phase of education, and that phase of education integrates with all others, so that all of these athletic activities are indeed a part of a true educational program.

I say I do not believe that this group should permit any doubt to exist with respect to that matter. There are various reasons why the doubt should not be permitted. One is that if your physical education and your intercollegiate competitions are on a sound basis, they will indisputably be educational by any kind of generally accepted definition of education.

Another reason why you should not permit the doubt to exist was recently brought very much to the fore in a case which I assisted in preparing with respect to the Federal tax on admissions to intercollegiate athletic events. Generally speaking, educational activities are not taxed, whether in private or publicly maintained institutions. If your physical

education and your intercollegiate competitions are not a part of education, they can be taxed, and will be taxed, and they are being taxed by the Federal government. One of the old aphorisms with respect to taxation is that the power to tax is the power to destroy. If our intercollegiate admissions are subject to Federal taxation at all, up to 10 per cent, they may be taxed 20 or 50 per cent. The power to tax has resulted in the destruction of some activities.

I do not know that the Federal government would at any time be likely to desire the destruction of intercollegiate competitions, but certainly in many institutions intercollegiate competitions are now being carried on at a loss, and if the loss is increased by 10, 20, or 30 per cent due to taxation, it may be that some schools will have to go out of intercollegiate competition.

The question is, in these tax cases, whether the state which maintains an educational institution, or a private charitable or eleemosynary educational institution, has laid aside a program of education and gone into the entertainment business. It seems to me quite definitely it has not done so when it embarks upon a program of intercollegiate athletics. Intercollegiate athletics we in this group know, as a matter of fact, have much to do with character training and character building of the young men who participate. A man who can participate in sports of violence according to rules has something, after he has learned to observe the rules and participate under circumstances where loss of temper is rather forgivable in a young man, which a young man who does not participate does not have.

It seems to me that in most of our institutions, as we study their catalogs, to a certain extent credit is given in the physical education course, and that course is a part of the course leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree. Credit is given for participation in intercollegiate athletics. It seems to me that the physical education departments should not be merely playground departments, but should be in truth and in every sense in which we can make them educational departments, and indeed it seems to me that we are bound to make that a truth and recognize that it is a truth and insist upon it as a truth, if we are going to keep this particular activity, which we know as intercollegiate competition, free from undue governmental interference and taxation.

PROFESSOR DUPREE (West Chester State Teachers College): Regarding the tax matter that was spoken of, we had a similar case some time ago, a test case so far as the Federal Government is engaged in taxing admissions to intercollegiate and interscholastic contests. If our charters showed our institutions to be in the nature of eleemosynary educational institutions, we would have no difficulty whatever in the matter of taxes. The question of evasion and avoidance comes in. But where we divert directly to entertainment, what we have heard is very correct in that we may be taxed up to 50 per cent. Our charters in a good many of the colleges do not show the recent addition of an athletic association in so far as it is educational. If we review our charters and find they are educational and eleemosynary, not in the form of subsidy to an individual but to the entire student body, we won't have any difficulty whatever in taxation. No college, as a rule, files a tax return, yet in our admissions tax we are required to file them when we play visiting teams or play games away.

In regard to the method of rating players, we have found this: a student is required to maintain an average grade of C or better; but before he can receive a varsity letter, he must maintain in his particular field of athletics,—basketball, football, baseball, track, or whatever activity he may participate in—a certain number of hours in practice, as well as in 50 per cent of the participating games, and an equivalent of 55 per cent of the non-participating games. That is the criterion as to whether or not he

has earned what the athletic division of a college awards to him. If we do not set up a schedule similar to the amount of units or credits for the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science or Master in postgraduate work, we are falling short of what athletic activities really mean to a college.

MR. ROMEYN BERRY (Cornell University): I confess that I came into this meeting as a stooge for Dr. Mercer. Perhaps I am using the language Dr. McKenzie mentioned, if not of the gambling joint, at least of the hotel lobby. I think you ought to bear charitably with anyone who attends a great many meetings of the National Collegiate Association, if he falls into speaking the language of the hotel lobby, having breathed the atmosphere thereof for countless hours.

Having stood where our chairman stood for a number of years, and knowing how these meetings sometimes bog down (is that the lobby or the gambling joint?), I realize that Dr. Mercer has provided himself with a person to prevent that thing happening, in fact I dare say many persons. Having come into the meeting with that unworthy motive, I have become interested, and even though the meeting shows no signs of bogging down, I want to ask a few questions.

In the first place, I am not at all clear as to what the topic is that we are to discuss, except that it has something to do with physical education and something to do with athletics and something to do with university organization and practice. There are one or two questions I wish to ask, which I may preface with one or two remarks. In order to qualify and to put myself in my proper niche, I may say that for seventeen years I have been connected primarily with intercollegiate competitive sport, but under an organization, or lack of it for most of that period, which placed upon my office the responsibility of maintaining the fields on which a certain amount of physical education takes place, and also outdoors swimming and skating. Perhaps that experience brings up two or three irritations which should not exist, and which I would like to have clarified in my mind.

In the first place, just what is physical education? Ordinarily, and as some gentlemen have said, it has been perfectly apparent that speakers approach the topic from very diversified experiences and organizations, and we know perfectly well that practices and organizations differ in different parts of the country. But in all places there are certain common factors. There is the medical jurisdiction which exists in some degree everywhere, sometimes associated with physical education and sometimes disassociated from it. Then you have in physical education everything from corrective exercises and what you might call therapeutic athletics down to just casual play.

There are three topics that stick in my mind simply because they are foggy and there has never been any crystallization of them. One has to do with this tendency to discuss casual sport and intramural sport versus competitive sport, and an assumption in a great many quarters that intramural and casual sport would benefit proportionately as the importance of intercollegiate competition was diminished. I see no reason whatever why that state of mind should exist in a properly coordinated institution, and indeed I think the reverse is true, and that the topic ought to be stated as casual and intramural sport and intercollegiate sport, each meshing together pleasantly and to the mutual advantage of the other.

We know perfectly well that that condition does not always exist, and we know that where swimming is an important and successful sport it is sometimes difficult for a boy to find five minutes when he can dive into the pool without hitting an intercollegiate champion, which is not a popular thing in any institution. We know perfectly well, mentioning names, that at Princeton, where they are particularly fortunate from an outsider's angle in having an artificial ice rink, the amount of casual skating that the student can take part in during the hockey season is limited.

Another thing—this question of compulsory athletics—has indicated to me the source of my irritation with a certain amount and certain phases of compulsory games, and I think it has to do with discipline. I, myself, was an innocent party to a breach of discipline, which I understand in some universities is not uncommon. Driving in a car which I once possessed, much larger and more expensive than the one I now drive, about five miles from the campus, I was held up by five young ladies, not dressed for walking and a long way from home, and was asked for a ride. I took them in gladly, and then discovered that they were on a compulsory hike, having cut some of their prescribed physical education. They were working off their cuts by taking an eight-mile walk in the country. The checker was stationed at the ultimate point on this hike. I do not know who had driven the ladies out in a car, but anyway they presented themselves in their high-heeled slippers to the checker, and had nothing to do then but to get back to the home checker, and they suggested that I drive them and drop them just short of the gymnasium, so that they might get their credit.

Probably I should not have mentioned this episode if it had occurred in the case of young men, but I think I will be absolved even by my own colleagues in the case of those very attractive young women who did not want to walk, and, from their very good looks, would probably have few occasions when they could not get a ride!

Now comes the other thing of discipline, with respect to intramural sports, the casual and innocent nature of which is held up for us to admire. I am one of those persons who was brought up in the so-called age of blood and iron, when the object of an athletic competition, particularly a team competition, was to win it, to win it, to be sure, under conditions and in a frame of mind which can be assumed among gentlemen and sportsmen. I think when dormitory A plays dormitory B, they ought to be out there to win, and I think that there is something wrong with competitive sport, however intramural, when, as I have sometimes seen, a boy knocks a ball that is good for three bases if run out and he stops on second, playing perfectly safe.

This is all in preface to asking certain questions. To what extent are competitive games physical education? Another irritation that I have is that physical education, as I see it around the country, seems to spawn statisticians. I am perfectly sick of receiving these statistics gorgeously arranged, from any number of departments of physical education. The last one is always the best, which proves that 80 per cent of their undergraduate body is engaged in intramural games, which are a grand thing for physical education, and you know perfectly darn well they are not. You know that every boy who comes out and plays one inning on his fraternity teams gets scored one for physical education, and when the same boy, if he is any good, plays on every one of his house teams, he gets a score of eight points. Sometimes I think there is going through this profession the same trend that went through certain other professions which resulted in real estate agents become realtors, and undertakers morticians, and there is a good deal of time wasted among all of us in trying to ennoble our occupations by terminology. While I think everything we are doing is fine, there is a tendency at times to forget that the profession is secondary, the institution is secondary, and in physical education, at least, the boy is everything, and that boys do not change, and one of the things that holds back academic communities, including physical education, is the fact that a boy between the ages of nineteen and twenty-one does not want to be educated either mentally or physically. He wants to lead the same sort of a life that his father did and come out pretty much the same sort of a citizen, and in most cases that is not a very bad ambition.

I am quite sure that the main desideratum is that we shall not, any of us, take ourselves too seriously or our jobs too seriously; that we spend more time with the boys and less with the statistics; that we thank

God that there is an end of the business that does not attract too much attention from the rest of the public and from the alumni associations, and that can be left more or less to the boys and the very intelligent group of men who are playing with them and urging them to play.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: Mr. Berry, you said you had a question to ask, and then you said you had another irritation, and I do not know whether your subsequent remarks were the answer to your question or whether you just forgot to ask it. Have you a real question you would like to ask?

MR. BERRY: How much do the men who tried it think of compulsory games? Do they add up with the balance in favor of them, or can you get enough out of it with a better spirit if you provide a place to play, which most colleges now do, a time to play, which few colleges now provide, and the wherewithal to play with?

CHAIRMAN MERCER: I would like to try to answer that question in part. I would rather preface my answer by saying that in my own thinking I have tried to divide boys generally into three groups. One group comprises, I suppose, some 30 to 40 per cent of boys who come to us, who are pretty well trained physically when they arrive. That is to say, their coordinations are pretty well set up. They have run the gamut of games ever since they were able to walk, even before that, and have leaned to all sorts of physical activity perfectly naturally and had a very good time doing it—the kind which, when they come to college, need no encouragement whatever, but who may be found everywhere around the athletic plant, in the athletic field, in the buildings, to the extent that sometimes you feel maybe it would be a good idea to tell them it might be well to spend a little more time in the late afternoons and evenings in academic pursuits.

Then you have the second group, which is probably another 35 per cent, maybe 40,—the type of boy who has not been passive about physical activity, but who has a desire to be physically expert in many things, and who, because of reluctance, awkwardness, or some other cause, has been more or less pushed to the outskirts of all the sports in which he has tried to participate, because of his lack of ability.

You have also the third group, which is the problem child of all of our physical education programs,—those who seem to have a definite abhorrence of everything physical, who are brought into the gymnasium under pressure, and who usually get very little out of their experience.

Of course, the two groups which come into the picture, in so far as Mr. Berry's question is concerned, are the latter two groups, and the middle group is the one which is placed where our required courses, or compulsory athletics, as he termed it, I think are doing the greatest good. They are setting a time, in the first place, for the boy to be present, the same as he is placed on the roster for German. He may not have liked to be subjected to German, but he was advised by his course adviser to take German, so he said, "All right, I shall take German." He reports for his recitations in German reluctantly, the same as he does to the gymnasium. Where I think compulsory athletics or compulsory physical education is good is that there is careful teaching, careful segregation, so that the boy is not embarrassed when he reports for his class work, and that he is given an opportunity, at least, to receive instruction in something which to him has been a goal unrealized for many years.

Through gradual processes of teaching, he acquires certain skills which put him in a position to start to enjoy the thing which he is doing in addition to all the other benefits which he may acquire from it. Those people who are involved in that sort of teaching tell me that they are stimulating in undergraduates a desire to play the games which they are teaching, and the boys return for the classwork with a certain amount of feeling that they are going to be exhilarated, going to be buoyed up, and

it ceases to become a compulsory period and becomes a voluntary period on their part.

I would like very much to hear someone else express himself on this topic which Mr. Berry has raised, because I think it is a very important one, the topic of compulsory athletics.

Professor Marsh, have you anything to say on that subject?

PROFESSOR A. W. MARSH (Amherst College): I have not prepared a speech on this subject. I would like to speak for a moment on what Mr. Berry has raised as a question. Amherst having been fortunate, or unfortunate, enough to have a program that has developed as Dr. McKenzie has outlined it, has had a compulsory course of three years of physical education. A short time ago, unfortunately possibly again, there was an attempt by Mr. Oosting of Trinity to get some opinions on the part of recent graduates from some of the New England colleges as to their views regarding their work in physical education. The colleges were fairly uniform in having a compulsory course. Strangely enough (and Mr. Oosting can check me on the statistics), I think it was between 80 and 90 per cent of those boys who said they believed distinctly in that required program. The amazing part of it was, although in those institutions they varied in their requirement from one to two or three years, ours being three years, there were a large number of those boys who said that they thought it would be better for the college to require physical education, which includes athletics and intramural sport, for the entire four years. I think that was due very largely to the fact that many of these programs, while using the compulsory feature merely as a structure on which to base their other activities, within that structure allowed each man a very wide selection of activities in which he was interested. In connection with that, I believe, as Mr. Berry has indicated, they had a good place to play, and they had, to a large extent, men with enthusiasm to play with them.

I am coming to a point about which I would like to speak—very probably there was not an excess of measurement or statistics. In connection with that point, I am interested very much in Dr. McKenzie's analysis, and as I have seen in the pressures for and against the physical education course, as such, receiving a place in the academic curriculum like any other subject, it seems to me that we are facing two things. One is a general tendency in all departments to view the man as a whole, rather than the man in separate parts. In that connection, it seems that physical education for those who are grading men carefully on a numerical basis might well try to study those men as a whole, and to give them credit for sportsmanship, for personality, for character, as we have had mentioned, but in general terms rather than in specific terms,—in terms that can be understood by the educators in the community and in other departments, and by members of the department itself. I am very anxious this morning that we should have criticisms from members of academic departments, from deans and presidents, regarding an attitude which has developed in places where academic credit has been given.

The question of academic credit is discussed from quite different angles, sometimes in places where the faculty are enthusiastic about the program of the Department of Physical Education, where the men on the staff of the department have been accepted by the community with a regular place on the faculty, where they have been college graduates, where they have been specialists for many years in sports.

The argument which has been used by members of the faculty who are participating widely in the program, who have every reason to be sympathetic with the ideals of the program, runs something like this. Fifteen or twenty years ago physical education was struggling for a place in the educational plan. At the present time we are willing to agree 100 per cent that that program is going better than it did. The inter-collegiate program is improved by having men of a different type con-

ducting athletic activities, and also supervising intramural sport and conducting the required activities.

There is no longer any criticism or complaint on the part of the undergraduates who accept the leadership and participation. Therefore, we believe that if these things are going successfully and are contributing to education, it is no longer necessary in the first place to continue extensive compulsory regulations regarding it, and, in the second place, we no longer believe it absolutely necessary that we should attempt to measure accurately and include that measure in the academic measure for the college degree.

I would like that particular point discussed, because it seems to me that that is a general attitude on the part of the institutions which do not give academic credit, on the part of institutions where academic credit may recently have been abandoned, and on the part of institutions who still do have academic credit. It seems to me that the question of measurement, the question of judging a man as a whole, has one particular point which physical educators might stress. In other words, if this thing that we are trying to do is as valuable as modern educators are willing to give it credit for, then it seems to me that it should be included in our scheme of education in the very same way that Latin or mathematics or history or any one of the other subjects is included.

DEAN R. L. SACKETT (Penn. State College): I suppose each of our points of view is more or less individual. My answer to the question concerning required participation in athletics is based upon a personal experience. I have been in education forty-five years, nearly forty-six. In that time I have never been ill. I have never been seriously ill but once, and that was in December of my Freshman year. And it was entirely because I did not know how to enter into athletic activities. I took up boxing myself, after this critical illness, and carried it on because it was easy to find contestants with whom to exercise. I did not have that which is so highly desirable, teaching, in order to increase my skill, but I enjoyed the boxing, and that brings me to the one point that I have to suggest.

I appreciate fully, I sympathize with, I have been in entire harmony with the purposes which were so excellently expressed by Dr. McKenzie. My business is engineering, you understand, and I look upon this purely from the avocational standpoint. But it seems to me that some of our coaches still insist upon confining much of their attention to the development of a world beater, whereas there are many boys who can be developed in fields of which they had never thought, as I had not thought. It was a life saver to me, there is no question about it, and it has been ever since, and I have never forgotten the lesson that I learned through a very serious illness. The one thing that I got out of it was not skill so much as fun, joy, the joy of a physical contest. I confess that is not a high ideal, and we could go into the aesthetic side and the rest, but I am confining myself for the moment to the purely animal side of the thing,—the value of compulsory physical education, in order to get us interested, or if we have an interest, to find our interest, to develop us in those fields where we are perhaps weakest, quite as Dean Mercer has said, just as we take some language or some other subject in college. Yet still, and I say still because it was true in my day, the fun of the thing we are in some measure missing.

Perhaps intramurals afford in some degree the opportunity. I do not favor playing a lackadaisical game. I appreciate fully what the coaches may do in developing more and more skill, but I am making an appeal for participation for the fun of the thing, for the joy of living, and may I call your attention to the fact that the International Olympic Committee put joy into its slogan. I realize slogans have done more harm to good straight athletic thinking, to honest thinking, than anything else, but

nevertheless, putting joy into sports, it seems to me, is a perfectly legitimate and appropriate thing, along with the educational and aesthetic values which we appreciate.

PROFESSOR T. N. METCALF (University of Chicago): I was much interested in what Mr. Marsh just said. When the University of Chicago some three or four years ago adopted its new plan, all class attendance requirements were discontinued. Along with that, the physical education requirement, of course, went by the board. I confess that I hesitated a good while before accepting a position at an institution where the requirement had been discontinued. After two and one-half years of experience there, I can say that I am glad it was discontinued, because I think in the course of time we are going to find something that is better than the old type of time requirement in physical education. I have even gotten so far in my thinking now that I am not even interested in setting up a physical education standard for the college certificate. I think that we need something broader than that.

At the University of Chicago at the present time they have set up standards by means of comprehensive examination in the academic field. What I would like to see is some way of measuring the non-academic side of a man. I would like to see a man meet a moral and recreational and social and health standard, all combined in one. I do not know how we are going to arrive at it, but I think that what we need is some way of saying, "You are, or you are not, the kind of a man that the University would like to give its certificate to."

I think that that implies a man who knows how to budget his time, a man who knows how to take care of his health, a man who has the proper moral character, who has sensible recreational habits; and rather than proposing a physical education standard at Chicago, we have decided to wait and see if we can get the other interested fields to go along with us in proposing some kind of a standard which will cover the whole individual in a way which involves something more than his intellectual achievement.

For a little while I thought we should set up a standard of physical educational achievement and habits and attitudes, but I believe now we can do something better. I have not a ghost of an idea how we are going to arrive at this standard, or how we are going to administer it, but I am hopeful that in the course of time we can arrive at something which will be better than setting up something in physical education alone, which will be comparable to standards of other educational fields, a bigger and broader thing that needs to be treated by an entirely different method.

PROFESSOR L. E. SWAIN (Brown University): I find my heart vibrating in sympathy with Mr. Marsh and Mr. Metcalf. I believe that, human nature being what it is, some of us do things that we like to do, fortunately situated individuals or unfortunately situated, as the case may be. Others of us do things which we have to do, and that is most of us. A few of us may have character enough to do things we ought to do, but most of us do not have that until we have a good, sound education. Therefore, as far as anything in any university being voluntary and voluntary only is concerned, I think it will touch only the group who need it the least. I do not know whether satisfactions in what you do and have done are any worthy criterion to judge by or not, but I have had about equal experience now in academic teaching, in athletic coaching, and in required physical education and intramurals—just about an equal number of years spent along those lines.

I have found two points of great satisfaction to me. I have found them in all these three lines of activity. On the one hand, you have extremely good scholars or good athletes and you can help them. You can talk things over with them. They may be able to give you valuable suggestions, and it is a great satisfaction to have interest like that.

The other thing that appeals to me as a point of extreme interest is the case of the fellow, to be very specific, who came to the swimming pool when I used to teach swimming, elementary required. He came because, finally, after several years of effort, the Dean had shut down and he had to come. I have seen that fellow so enthusiastic after he finally passed the test that he came up in his noon hours and sneaked in when he was not supposed to, after he had graduated, to get a swim. I will admit that this is perhaps an unusual instance, but it is not unusual in the sense that there are many who do the same thing to perhaps a less degree, and I have seen fellows who could not pick up both feet (it sounds ridiculous; you have all probably experienced it) from the floor to take a little jump. To get them to do that and feel that they have accomplished something,—I think there is where we begin the building of proper characters.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: I would like to add to the testimony which has just been given the fact that we have at the University of Pennsylvania a swimming requirement. Four or five years ago a fellow who was very proficient in one branch of sport, who had lived on the Atlantic Seaboard all his life, whose family were seafaring people to the extent that they owned boats and he had spent hours upon hours on the beach during the summer time in his bathing suit, had never been in the water above his knees. He spent most of his time talking to the girls on the beach. He came to me at the end of his Freshman year when he received a condition, and asked if that condition might be carried over and made a part of his next year's physical education. It was granted. In my second interview, I realized this man was not only unable to swim (he really wanted to do the job), but there was some peculiar embarrassment which I had not quite analyzed, and he asked to have the condition carried over into his Junior year, which was granted. He finally came back in his Senior year, and said, "I cannot pass that swimming test. I want to pass it. I do not know how I am going to get around to it, but I suppose it has to be a part of this year's program." I said, "Yes, it does." By that time I had realized that here was a man who should have that experience. So as soon as he had finished his fall sport, I called him in and said, "I am going to make an appointment with the man who teaches swimming, and if you would like to go there at a time when there is no one else present, that is entirely open to you. If you would like to go into a class, that is open, but you must do one or the other." He elected the former, and in four lessons he learned to swim, and that man is certainly grateful for the requirement which we placed on him. That can be repeated many, many times in all your experience, those of you who have conducted work on a compulsory basis.

There has been a great deal of talk this morning about the joy of participation, by Mr. Marsh; about the will to win, by Mr. Berry; and I listed a question here which, it seems to me, comes close to the topic which we are involved in this morning, particularly in our relationships between the physical side of our college work and the academic side; and that is that the Western Conference, I understand, several years ago attempted to regulate the length of time to be included in football practice, blackboard talks, and so on. The plan was adopted and tried by one or two institutions in the conference for a short period of time. I do not care to say whether it has been continued or not, but it goes without saying that in many of our institutions there is a one-sided development of the boy, in that some football coaches and other coaches claim so much of his time for practice, for study, for blackboard discussions, that the boy himself reports that he is too tired to do any academic work during a certain season of the year, or he explains that the reason why he has slipped down in a certain course or courses is because he has given so much time and energy to the physical side of his college life.

I am wondering whether we should not discuss this morning whether or not we should not make in our institutions privately an analysis as to whether the time and energy requirements of our athletic boys are not too great in relation to what we expect of them on the academic side. If you care to, I should like to hear some discussion before we close this morning's meeting on that particular subject. I do not think it is fair to allow you men to leave this room this morning until we, at least, give an opportunity for our president, Major Griffith, to speak to us, or at least to say "How do you do."

MAJOR GRIFFITH: Romeyn Berry stood here a moment ago and made two confessions. First, he confessed that he was one of Roy Mercer's stooges, and, second, he confessed that at one time he had aided and abetted certain young ladies in the commission of a crime. I want to tell you first that I am not one of Roy's stooges, and that I am not going to confess my sins, because time is too short.

Answering Roy's question, I am reminded that when I started coming to these meetings thirty years ago I thought I knew all the answers to all of these questions, such as we have been discussing, but today I am not quite so sure that I know the exact answer to all of them.

I have been listening to these very interesting discussions regarding compulsory physical education. I remember that when I was coaching football I thought everybody in the university ought to play football. When I was coaching track, I thought it would be fine if every boy entered the track activities. Today I am not quite so sure that we ought to insist that all of the students do any one thing. Perhaps they ought to be required to take some kind of physical education activity. Civilization requires different types of men. We need the executive type, and we need the research type, and all the different types, and we give the boy his choice in all these different things. I am not sure but that that is better than for us to want to make everybody do the thing that we think everybody ought to do.

It seems to me that this question of the relation of these things to education depends, first, on our definition of education. If we accept the N. E. A. definition, or the North Central definition, it seems clear that we can show that this thing we are talking about has a place in the educational program.

I do not think we can prove that if we give the boy this training he is a better citizen as a result of the training in accordance with those various definitions, but we will have to take the testimony of people who have been through it, and studies that I have known about indicate that for the most part the men who have been through it would like to have their sons do the same thing. In other words, they think it is worth while.

I like the point that Dr. McKenzie brought out, that we should not shy away from some of these things because there is a certain amount of discipline involved in them. Dean Inge says everywhere we go we find the demand to make life safe, easy, and fool-proof. We want to be personally conducted through life, with all the risks assumed by somebody else, and after a few years of that kind of existence, he suggests that we would ultimately become as helpless as the old slave-owners who starved to death in sight of food, because they had been used to having it put into their mouths by their slaves.

I like the old-fashioned idea that a man will do hard things and get joy from them, as Dean Sackett said. He elected to box. That is not an easy physical activity, and he got pleasure out of that kind of a difficult athletic exercise. I like the idea of our American boys choosing, if you please, sports that put a premium on that sort of thing, training. They get pleasure out of it.

The man who is enamoured of the soft life cannot see any fun in

playing football, or climbing a mountain, or doing anything difficult. I am glad that we have a lot of seventeen and eighteen and nineteen-year-old boys who can see fun in doing things of that sort. Let us not let the man who does not think there is any fun in it make it impossible for the chap who does get pleasure out of it to have his opportunity to do these things.

I think that is all I have to say, except that if it is true that civilization rests on a diversity of opinion, and perhaps if it is also true that the finest things in life are not susceptible of definition, then we need not be disturbed if year after year we come here and find that we do not entirely agree on all of these various controversial points, and the discussion of them is eminently worth while. Each man works out his own conclusions after listening to others' opinions and then goes ahead and probably does just as good a job as somebody who goes at it from another way. In other words, I hope we never get to the point where we think we all have to do it according to some man's plan or some man's program.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: Professor Badger, would you care to speak this morning?

PROFESSOR P. O. BADGER (New York University): I do not feel I am very well qualified to talk on a topic that is as broad in scope as the one in your program. For example, I have never had any technical experience, nor administrative responsibility on student health programs. I am sorry to say that, although I have taken compulsory courses in undergraduate physical education, I do not know very much about that subject beyond what my own experience has been. My only administrative responsibility in connection with this whole topic has been on the side of intercollegiate athletics, which is, of course, only one phase of your general problem. Perhaps I may say just one word very briefly on that.

I realize that for administrative purposes, physical education, student health, and intercollegiate athletics have been grouped together in a great many institutions. That seems to be the tendency today. I find no quarrel with that. I realize that certain problems have crept in in connection with student health, physical education, and intercollegiate athletics, which has made it desirable for the university administrators to take cognizance of these things, and to try to improve conditions and to try to run them.

As far as intercollegiate athletics go, it means that the tendency seems to be to get away from alumni control and undergraduate control, and to make boards of trustees, university presidents, or committees delegated by them, attend to the administrative details of intercollegiate athletics. I do not think that is the ideal set-up by any means, but the circumstances are such that that has come about and we have to face it. As a matter of fact, I think a great many of the evils we face today can be corrected only by that type of set-up.

I hope that, where physical education and intercollegiate athletics are grouped together administratively, those in control will not lose sight of the fact that, after all, intercollegiate athletics fundamentally ought to be play and not science. I believe intercollegiate athletics should not be considered a part of the curriculum or academic program, and that the only interest of the educator or college president in them should be in certain administrative problems that come up and that defy solution, unless they, the presidents and boards of trustees, step in and run them until the situation is straightened out some day when perhaps the sports can be given back to the undergraduates to run as play and not as a business.

CHAIRMAN MERCER: Near the front of the room is a man whom you all know. I would like to have him say a word before we close this

meeting. Professor Kennedy of Princeton, would you care to make some remarks to this group?

PROFESSOR CHARLES W. KENNEDY (Princeton University): I came late this morning, but I heard the latter portion of Dr. McKenzie's excellent paper, and heard it with great pleasure. I heard the characteristically witty remarks of Mr. Berry of Cornell, whom we expect to hear and enjoy hearing on all these occasions.

I have listened to Dean Distler, Dean Sackett, and Professor Marsh. Each has touched some phase of this very broad problem, and I found myself in sympathy with the points that they have made. What has been running through my mind as a result of it all, I think, is something like this. In the first place, we ought to rejoice that the history of the past two or three decades in this country in the matter of administration of our colleges has shown such a progressive improvement in conditions surrounding intercollegiate sport, in conditions making for the development on a broad basis of intramural sports, and in conditions developing and strengthening and recognizing the service of the health departments of our colleges, all three of which, of course, represent, at least in my mind, or ought to represent, a unity, a synthesis of what we are trying to do on one side of their lives for the boys that come to our colleges.

However, that is not a complete synthesis. There remains, of course, still the building up of the larger unity into the more important trainings which the parents of those boys wish them to have, and which we wish to give to them.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association, as I see it, approaches this whole problem of sport from an entirely different angle, necessarily different, desirably different, from the angle from which any other athletic body would approach the problem of sport. It is not merely that we are interested in amateur sport as such, and wholly amateur sport, but that we are interested in amateur sport as one element in the training of the youth of the country in the educational institutions of the country.

That is the unique point of view, it seems to me, that governs and ought to govern all discussions of whatever nature that arise in this body, and when one questions from that point of view what is the motive from which we approach the development of intramural sport or intercollegiate sport or the health services of our colleges, or all three combined, I think the answer is this, that our primary concern is not in intercollegiate sport; our primary concern is not in intramural sport; our primary concern is not in the health services of the colleges; and I will add, as a member of the English Department of Princeton, that our primary concern is not solely on the intellectual side. Our primary interest is in the boy. When his parent turns him over to the school, or to the college, it represents, in my mind, one of the greatest acts of trust and faith that a man can make, because, however incoherent the parent may be, however incapable he may be of putting into precise words in his talks with us what it is that he wishes us to do for the boy, we know what he wishes. We are not dependent upon his statement. He wishes us to take that boy and to give him, on every side of his life, the kind of training that will fit him for intelligent, disciplined, generous manhood and strong citizenship in this country. That is what he wishes. He wishes us to realize for him all his hopes in the boy who bears his name and who is to follow in his footsteps.

There can be no greater act of faith, no greater act of trust, gentlemen, than that, and it seems to me there could be no greater act of recreancy to a trust than if those of us who are concerned in the administration of colleges in various ways should fail to see the unity of demand that rests upon us, if we should permit ourselves to become narrowly concerned with this one phase of the boy's training and development, or that other phase.

Sometimes, after between thirty and thirty-five years of service on a college faculty, I wonder whether that isn't the gravest danger and the besetting sin of college faculties. I am not thinking now merely of questions that might arise as between the physical training of that boy and the intellectual training. I think there are others in the room besides myself who have listened, perhaps disheartened, to faculty discussions as to the relative value of a training in Latin as over against a training in economics, or a training in modern languages as over against a training in science. I think it is sometimes a disheartening thing to think that the number of men who are thinking of the boy rather than of the department or of the subject seems to be (let us hope that that is not true) such a small number, and that those who are concerned with the technology of particular fields of study are so absorbed in those and forgetful of the human values entrusted to them.

That is what has run through my mind this morning, and from that point of view, gentlemen, I wish that it were possible that we could have more deans and many more presidents of colleges at our meetings than we have. I think one of the very satisfactory things about these annual meetings is that year by year the number of college deans who have associated themselves with us in these meetings has been steadily increasing, and their contribution to the discussions of this body, to the freshening of points of view and the enlargement of discussion, has been a most valuable one.

I would like to suggest that in the long run the responsibility for the synthesis and the unity that I suggest, the responsibility for the enforcement in our colleges of a point of view that will prevent separations and clashes of interest and will draw men into efficient harmony in recognizing that their responsibility is not to Latin or to economics or to science or to physical education or to intercollegiate athletics, but to the boy,—that the final responsibility for that rests upon the college president. Nobody can relieve him of it.

It is inevitable in the set-up of the American college, and the American university synthesis focuses in the president's office. The attempts to destroy that synthesis, whether they come from outside the institution, as they sometimes do, or from within, focus upon the president's office. I wish, therefore, that it would be possible for us as the years go by to enlist the active presence and participation in our discussion of larger numbers of college presidents, because of the importance of the issues that we are discussing, the importance of the implications of those issues.

We have made progress, we are making progress every year. I do not need to remind you of what the conditions were thirty years ago with respect to the health services of our colleges. I do not need to remind you how few colleges then existed in which a system of team physicians and experienced care of our athletes on that side existed. They were very few, and the years since have promoted and developed their increase in a most satisfactory and heartening degree.

We have every reason in this organization, not to be satisfied (I hope we will never be satisfied), but to be pleased with the progress that has been sanely and steadily made, thanks very largely to the men of vision and leadership in this organization who, through so many years, have borne the heat and burden of education of the public and of their colleagues in these matters.

I agree with Mr. Berry about the matter of the will to win. I hope that never in intramural or intercollegiate sport will we be willing to visualize a system in which it makes no difference to the boy whether he wins or whether he does not. Why do I say that? Not because I think the winning makes a great deal of difference. In a game between honorable rivals both cannot win in any given year, nor would it be well if one of them could win year after year in an uninterrupted series. That would not be for the good of sport. We would not wish it. It is not

that the winning in any given year makes the difference. What makes the difference is that any boy on that field should have done any less than his utmost best, because it is as true in physical activity as it is in mental activity that the individual who teaches himself to be contented with something less than his best is cutting at the very roots of an efficient life.

That is why I hope that in intercollegiate or intramural sports there will never be a lessening of competitive spirit under fine, honorable, generous, sportsmanlike rules.

For one other reason—a standard of excellence. There has been much talk this morning about standards of measurement, standards of this, standards of that. We need standards. We cannot get on without them. But the standard that we need most, I think, in every phase of life, is the standard of excellence,—esthetically, morally, intellectually.

How are we to know what is fine, what is worthy, what is straight thinking, and what represents the hard, clean, competitive struggle? We must have for these boys, who will be the men of a time so few years off, a standard that will teach them what to love, teach them what to hope for, teach them what is worth fighting for, and teach them what is worth respecting in their own endowment, physical and mental.

It is because the competitive spirit sets up as a visible symbol to these boys a standard of excellence to shoot at that even though it sets it up in a field in which the boy will not do his life work, and which will not be for his life the most important field, nevertheless, the fact that that standard is set up in a field which during those years of his late adolescence and early manhood means so much to him means it is being set up where he will accept it and where he will come to recognize the value of it, not merely there, but through all phases of his life.

This is a long way perhaps from some of the detailed points that have been discussed, and yet I do not think anything has been said this morning that has not had implications that lead toward that synthesized point of view, that sense of responsibility in the colleges and universities of the country to the boys that we undertake to train for manhood and for citizenship. Therefore, the more widely our discussions range, the more widely our colleges can be represented in these discussions and various points of view can be brought to focus upon them, the better it will be.

Just one more point. At all costs, it seems to me, we should avoid falling into the trap of thinking that when we come here to talk about sport we are talking about some one thing. We are talking about many things, sport carried on in many kinds of institutions, in many areas of the country, facing different problems in many ways, and, therefore, we have to solve those problems by methods which, on the whole, prove themselves as being most effective.

That is why I sympathize so heartily with what your president just said as to the way in which we should open-mindedly approach these problems, open-mindedly listen to the experience and the opinions of others, and then with that gathered and enlarged experience return to work out our own salvation. That is certainly a sound plan, and sport itself is not one thing, it isn't merely that we have many sports and it isn't merely that they differ from one another in various ways, but there are fundamental differences in those sports, and I should like to close with a point that I may perhaps have stressed before, but which I think is worth thinking of because of certain conclusions that flow from it.

You can group all these sports that we deal with into three categories. They are either measurement sports, or they are interference sports, or they are physical contact interference sports. It makes a lot of difference which one of our sports fits into which category.

By a measurement sport, I mean such a sport as track. There a competitor is free to mobilize his utmost of speed, of strength, of skill. Nobody interferes with him, and all, really, that happens is that we

measure his utmost and we compare it with the utmost of his competitors. We rate them on a scale and say, "This man is the best." That is why in some ways the measurement sports enforce this standard of excellence of which I have spoken better than any, because the standard is precise in measuring.

Then there are interference sports, of which a good example would be tennis, where it isn't a question merely of measuring the skill of the individual, but where the very essence of the game and the rules of the game permit each competitor to interfere as far as he possibly can under the rules laid down with the game of his opponent. That is precisely what the tennis player is trying to do at every moment, to interfere with and break up in legitimate ways his opponent's game. That has gone on beyond measurement. In tennis there is no physical contact.

Then you come to the physical contact interference sports, of which good examples would be the great game of football, and that great sport, boxing. In football not only is it legitimate under the rules clearly laid down to interfere with your opponent's game, but it is also legitimate to use physical contact in doing so.

The purpose of that analysis is merely this. It is foolish to talk about the results that a competitor gets from track as if they were the results that he gets from football. In a great many ways it is the physical contact interference sports that give the finest training that we can give boys in sport, because not only must they have the will to win, the competitive spirit, the courage to hang on in the face of odds against them, but they must have built up a rugged physique. They must have the courage to take the hard knocks of the game. They must have the intelligent skill to use that physique in such way as to interfere properly and effectively with their opponent's game, and they must learn that in that sport, where there may be because of that physical contact interference the greatest temptation to loss of temper or to lack of sportsmanship, right there, if they will stand up against temptation and meet the standards of the game, is one of the finest training of sportsmanlike skill in the whole range of sport.

Obviously, you cannot talk about those three things as if they were one thing; so all through the range of the interests that bring us together there are the special problems, the special concerns, and an intelligent approach, it seems to me, rests upon an inevitable analysis so that we have analysis at the bottom and, I hope, this broad synthesis and unity at the top—diversification in our programs, unity and synthesis in the development of a boy into a fine, generous sportsmanlike man and citizen.

APPENDIX II

THE N. C. A. A. CODE ON RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING OF ATHLETES

Report on Replies to Questionnaire

The Annual Convention of 1934 adopted a committee report distinguishing between legitimate and illegitimate methods of recruiting college athletes.

The Code defined illegitimate methods of recruiting as follows:
It is unjustifiable—

- (1) For a student to receive any subsidy of monetary value, either directly or indirectly, primarily for his athletic services.
- (2) To employ prospective athletes before they matriculate in an institution, or to make advance payment to a prospective student for future services, or to make any guarantee of payment which is not conditioned upon the service being performed in advance of the payment, or to make any payment for services at a rate greater than the current rate for other students in the institution.
- (3) To permit a boy to participate in intercollegiate contests who has ever received a loan, scholarship aid, remission of fees, or employment, primarily because he is an athlete, through channels not open to non-athletes equally with athletes.
- (4) For members of athletic or physical education staffs to recruit athletes by initiating correspondence or conversation, or by arranging for interviews with boys who are prospective athletes.
- (5) To promise prospective athletes employment, loans, scholarships, or remission of fees, except as they may be secured by other students through the regular channels of the institution, and those channels should be outside the athletic or physical education departments.
- (6) For alumni groups, clubs, fraternities, or other organizations to make promises of direct or indirect subsidies to prospective students, primarily for their athletic ability.

- (7) To endeavor to persuade a prospective athlete, by offer of a scholarship or a job, or by any other means, to transfer from a college where he has made application for admission and has been accepted.

The Secretary of the Association sent to the 150 members a questionnaire asking the officers who determine eligibility in the several institutions to state which of the seven items of the Code defining unjustifiable methods of recruiting they approved, and, if approved, whether they were enforcing the principle therein contained. Replies were received from about 100, so that the figures given below represent in each case approximately the percentage of total replies. The colleges replying may be classified in two groups, Group I indicating those that approve all the items and Group II, those that do not approve one or more of them. Group I is further sub-divided into two groups, Group I (a) comprising the colleges that are, in their opinion, enforcing the principles in question, Group I (b) those that, believing in the principles, are for one reason or another hesitant to claim that they are enforcing them.

Group I (a)

Thirty-six colleges and universities answer "yes", without qualification, to all seven of the items, implying both approval and enforcement. (Two of this number, while replying in the affirmative to the query regarding approval, do not fill out the blank as to enforcement. The omission may be intentional, but from what is known of the high ideals in sport of both institutions, it seems reasonable to conclude that the affirmative reply was intended for both questions, hence the two colleges are included in this group.)

Unless these replies are merely formal and perfunctory, or made without actual knowledge of conditions prevailing in the respective institutions, we may conclude that something over one-third of our members who reported believe in and are carrying out *in toto* the high ideals set forth in the Code.

Remarks

Under the head of Remarks those reporting for the colleges were asked to state their objections, if any, to the several articles of the Code and to suggest possible improvements in wording. Under the head of General Remarks they were requested to offer opinions on the best method of attacking the evils of recruiting and subsidizing college athletes, and particularly as to the difficulties of carrying out the principles of the Code in spirit as well as in letter.

These are some of the suggestions coming from Group I.

"I believe that the only way to combat these evils, which are said to be worse now than ever before, is by giving full publicity to the offending institutions in the manner of the Carnegie Report. This calls, of course, for an investigating service and money."

"One solution is the determination on the part of college presidents, administrators, and faculties that subsidization of athletes within their respective colleges will not be tolerated. The next essential is that the supervision of athletics should be in the hands of a competent and courageous director, with faculty status, appointed by the same governing body that appoints all heads of departments. This person should be the type who will have the confidence of the faculty as well as of alumni and undergraduates. He should be assisted and advised by a small committee made up of two or three members of the faculty, and an equal number of alumni and of undergraduates. This committee should be appointed by the regular appointing authorities of the college. With such a plan of control over athletics I believe that in institutions that have academic standards worthy of the name of a college such policies as you have outlined could be enforced. Their enforcement, however, requires courage and eternal vigilance, and will result in unpopularity."

"We are entirely out of sympathy and out of step with current football practices."

"What can be done about those institutions that not only guarantee board, room, books, tuition, and \$2 per day to any boy making the squad? This is an open practice. A few institutions take a bus and go out of their state and recruit a bus load of boys and carry them back to their institution. I ask you, what chance have we got in athletic competition when these practices are common with some of our leading institutions? Frankly, I believe something more than talking about it must be done. I think that frank and open publicity, naming institutions and practices, may be the next step. At present, the situation is rotten, and it is getting worse."

"I am very much in favor of the method which the N. C. A. A. is employing in appealing to university and college presidents for assistance in stamping out the recruiting and subsidizing of athletes. I believe that this evil can be eliminated only by hammering away at it in such fashion as to force action on the part of the presidents."

"The N. C. A. A. should approve and publish a Code on recruiting and subsidizing of athletes. This Code should be sent to college presidents each year, asking if they are living up to it. A list should be published of those colleges not living up to the Code. After this list has been published, colleges that do not subsidize athletes can decide whether they wish to compete with those that do."

"I agree with the policies established by the N. C. A. A. The Association is an advisory body and not a rule-making or law-enforcing group. The question of illegitimate recruiting and subsidization of athletes must be controlled by local institutions, the conference, and organizations that they belong to. I do not believe the colleges have made any appreciable progress during the past year relative to this question. I am of the opinion that the evil has increased. The largest subsidizing fund that has ever been raised is the one now in effect, giving Federal and State aid to students. It is true that some institutions are not abusing this fund, but others are carrying practically all their athletes on it. However, I am not alarmed about present conditions as affecting our own institution, so long as we enforce our one-year rule which requires our athletes to do the same standard of scholastic work as the other students, and requires them to secure passing grades."

"Most, if not all, of the evils in connection with recruiting and subsidizing of athletes are the results of the necessity of making money. I see no way out for the big institutions that are involved in huge stadia and big staffs and tied up with many vested interests. However, the

smaller independent liberal arts colleges can cut loose and put football on a really amateur basis. Where gate receipts are not a major consideration there is little desire and necessity to recruit and subsidize."

Group I (b)

Thirty-eight colleges answer "yes" to the question of approval, but do not feel that they can conscientiously reply in the affirmative to the question as to enforcement, some because of their ignorance as to what alumni, individually or in groups, may be doing in violation of the principles of the Code, others because they doubt the feasibility of enforcing these principles. Combining Groups I (a) and I (b), we find that three-quarters (74) of our members who answered the questionnaire agree with our committee in enunciating certain principles, but that only 36 per cent are confident that they are carrying them out, while 38 per cent are doubtful about it. Item 6 raises the chief question, though item 4, and to a lesser degree item 1, are also stumbling blocks. Some of the points raised in the replies may be quoted.

Remarks

Item 1

"There are undoubtedly some boys in college receiving financial aid from alumni whose interest in them is, in part at least, due to their athletic ability. There are plenty of others similarly helped who take no part in athletics; certainly there is no organized activity along this line."

"Universal practice of subsidy has made it practically unenforceable."

"Yes, so far as the University is concerned. Some alumni may be giving assistance without our knowledge."

"Difficulty in administration lies in ascertaining whether such help is primarily for athletic services when obtained outside of institution and family."

"Southwest Conference rules permit receipt of subsidies on the part of any person or persons related to athlete " by previous friendship, family ties," or prompted "by professional interest not in any way connected with athletics."

"Business men and individuals probably privately give jobs of a more or less fictitious nature to some players. I do not know anything I can do as to this."

Item 4

"Approved in principle, but almost impossible to enforce."

"As far as possible."

"Practically impossible to be sure."

"Unenforceable, because there are too many ways of evading."

"Yes. It would be unreasonable and impracticable, however, to restrict members of these staffs from presenting the educational advantages of the institution to prospective freshmen by methods commonly approved for use by college administrative officials in attracting students in other fields. Care should be taken to avoid abuses."

"Probably not enforced. All the members of the faculty are urged to interest promising young men to enter this college, and in doing so such contacts are probably made."

"Enforced off the campus, not on it. Our coaches feel free to talk with prospective students whenever they come to our campus."

"No rule against it in our conference. Wrong only from the point of view of educational policy."

"No. Our conference permits members of athletic staffs to contact prospective students within certain limitations."

"No. The system on the Pacific Coast will not permit living up to this policy."

"Mighty difficult to enforce. To 'recruit' seems to beg the question."

Item 6.

"We cannot control the action of individual alumni."

"Impossible to enforce, except as information reaches us."

"To the best of our knowledge."

"So far as possible. Something of this sort doubtless goes on without the knowledge of university or athletic officials, but when discovered, should not be ignored."

"How can this be done?"

"This involves the obvious difficulty of controlling those on whom we have no direct hold."

"No institution can count on this 100 per cent. This is the main battle front. High educational standards form a good corrective."

"Yes, though it is practically impossible to discover such cases."

"Probably some activities of this nature are conducted under cover."

"Uncontrollable. We feel that this is unjustifiable, but find it impossible to entirely control."

"I don't see what we can do if boys are sent us under above conditions."

"It is impossible to be absolutely sure what alumni or fraternities may do in subsidizing athletes. I am quite sure not very much is done or I should know about it."

"It is almost impossible to prove when such subsidies are *primarily* for athletic ability."

"No, because we know of no way to control off-campus organizations or individuals."

"We preach it, but I don't know to what extent groups named above are deterred."

General

"We believe in maintaining the highest standards in intercollegiate sport. It is difficult for a conscientious person to give a categorical 'yes' or 'no' to the questions regarding enforcement. I can simply state that we are doing our best."

"While we strongly support in principle the points set forth in your questionnaire the enforcement of all of them is not entirely within our reach on account of the make-up of our Athletic Council (one trustee, three faculty members, three undergraduates, and four alumni)."

"These resolutions as a whole are in the right direction. Their effectiveness must depend, however, on the standards and on the honesty of students, alumni, faculty, and administration."

"The maintenance of the same standards of admission and of scholarship for athletes and others is the strongest anchor to windward."

"It is my judgment that those interested in athletics in a college or university cannot be prevented from using persuasion in bringing athletes to their institution." (From a university president).

"This is our big problem, largely on account of our not being able to discover the facts in any given case."

"I feel that there has been a let down in enforcement of rules in our conference during the past two or three years. One of the main factors, I think, is the fact that some institutions from other sections of the country have sent their representatives into our state and put forth every effort to lure our athletes to their schools, hence the temptation to offer inducements in order to keep them. I do not feel that our conference rules are being enforced in letter and in spirit."

"A classification of colleges according to *honest* eligibility standards would be a big step in clearing up present difficulties."

"We feel that the differences in scholastic standards that exist between different educational institutions militate against the minimizing of subsidizing and recruiting. If at the end of the Freshman year all men would have to pass an eligibility examination in certain basic subjects, the emphasis would be thrown back upon scholastic attainment."

"I believe a great deal of benefit would be derived from rigid Freshman and transfer rules, and a strict application of scholastic eligibility. It seems to me this would eliminate those who come to college just to play football, and also the tramp athlete."

"One of the best methods of curbing subsidization and the recruiting of athletes is to get conferences and certain professional educational associations, such as the North Central Association, the Association of University Professors, etc., to admonish institutions that indulge in these practices, even to the point of discrediting their students, if they do not comply with the proper standards of amateurism. I wish to commend the N. C. A. A. for its stand on these matters. I hope that steps may be taken to make it a more permanent and more effective policy of the Association."

"It seems to me that the amateur standing of college athletes can be maintained effectively only so far as general sentiment supports the ideal toward which we are working. Passing rules is not nearly so important as are the opinions of those who administer them."

"The tendency to make it legitimate for member institutions in a conference to pay athletes enough to finance their stay in college (board, room, books, tuition, and other necessary living expenses) is the flower and fruitage of the commercialism that has bitten nearly all of our institutions."

Group II

One quarter (25) of the colleges replying to the questionnaire do not approve one or more of the recommendations of the Code. All seven items are objected to by one or more of the colleges. Eighteen colleges raise objections to item 4, eleven to item 6, five to item 3, three to items 1, 5, and 7, and two to item 2. These objections may be stated by items as follows.

Item 1

"I am not sure. Every college desires students of special abilities, musicians, debaters, etc. Why not athletes? Provided rigid academic standards are maintained, why should not special abilities in all fields be allowed to have their just weight?"

"History of football proves that this provision has not: in all probability will not: if, indeed, it ever can be generally enforced."

"No. It seems that in this country we should come to the point of view that it is justifiable to offer help to needy students even though they be athletes. We believe that this help should be given only to those who are *bona fide* students and who show a definite need. The help given should cover tuition charges, be administered by the University, and be given only to those who maintain a certain scholastic standard. Schools in certain districts could very well cooperate to make it possible to overcome tuition differentials without giving more to prospective athletes."

"No. Our conference has under consideration the granting of athletic scholarships, providing tuition, board, and lodging. We are in sympathy with this proposal."

Item 2.

"I cannot see anything unjustifiable in occasionally employing a prospective student at ordinary labor around the athletic plant before his matriculation, even though he be an athlete."

"Depends on merit in each case."

Item 3.

"Equity of this debateable. To put it into practice would only bring about a new era of subterfuge and methods of evasion."

"It is conceivable that a School of Physical Education might set up a number of competitive scholarships for its own students. These scholarships by their very nature would be limited to a large extent to athletes, and we can see no objection to them. Furthermore, we do not see why we should bar a boy from competition who has received a scholarship from a Service Club which has been interested in him because of his athletic prowess. As long as the boy has met our scholastic requirements we should not discriminate against him anymore than we should against a student who has been helped primarily because he is a debater or a journalist. However, we believe that a scholarship should be limited to tuition and should not exceed this."

Item 4.

"All our athletic coaches are members of the faculty."

"No. A believer in the college, whether belonging to the athletic staff or not, naturally endeavors to interest his friends. Promises are not made, but interest may be stimulated. If this is recruiting, clarification is needed."

"No objection to this if no academic, financial, or other advantages not available for non-athletes are offered."

"Qualified coaches should not make a business of it."

"It is not unjustifiable for any member of the faculty to initiate correspondence or conversation, or to arrange for interviews with boys with a view to interesting them in entering his college. Whether the boy is a prospective athlete or not is beside the question."

"This rule is so impossible of enforcement, and so easily evaded in many ways, that it seems to me unwise to have such a statement in our Code."

"The coach, being a member of the resident teaching staff, should have the same privilege in this matter as any other member of the staff."

"No. These parties are better qualified to do the work than others who undertake it and often do more harm than good."

"It is just as reasonable for members of the staff to do this as for them to have alumni do it."

"If it is assumed that the athletic staff may follow up inquiries, it is but hiding our heads in the sand to say they cannot initiate the correspondence."

Item 5.

"This statement is too broad and ambiguous. We heartily endorse the position which states that these aids should be administered outside of the physical education and athletic departments. They should be administered through the same channels that take care of university scholarships, and should be subjected to the same regulations that are applied to scholarships given to other students."

"No, not as a whole. This provision includes three propositions which should be separated into at least two different propositions."

Item 6.

"No. Impossible to control by the colleges."

"We do not think colleges could, or should try, to control such matters."

"I do not consider it unjustifiable for a fraternity, for instance, to promise a *bona fide* job to a boy who is an athlete in an attempt to get him to enter the university and join the organization. I do not consider this a subsidy, direct or indirect."

"We object to this because we believe that these various organizations should be educated to limit their aid to tuition and only to needy students. We don't believe that it is possible to prevent this type of aid, and are not too sure that it should be prevented. Organizations can be appealed to for cooperation in the limitation of aid to tuition. We will merely drive all this sort of thing under cover if we try to prohibit it entirely. It is far better to have it in the open under the supervision of the university and to endeavor to secure the cooperation of the various organizations in the limitations of their aid."

"Few, if any, institutions can or should undertake to dictate beyond their own jurisdiction."

Item 7.

"Believing that a certain type of college and a certain kind of education is preferable for a certain class of boys, and that our institution, therefore, is preferable for a certain class of boys, we do not think it unjustifiable to endeavor to persuade a boy of this certain class to enter this institution. Whether he is a prospective athlete or not is beside the question. And the fact that he has made application for admission and has been accepted by another college should make no difference. It is a common custom for high school graduates to make application for admission to several colleges, and then to choose from amongst those which have accepted their application. There is no question of transfer; a student can transfer only from a college where he has been in actual attendance."

APPENDIX III

REPORT OF THE TREASURER, 1935

FRANK W. NICOLSON, in account with the
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

1935	Dr.	
	To balance carried forward	\$5,237.30
Jan. 1	University of Georgia	25.00
	Physical Education Association (program)	15.00
	Student Health Association (program)	15.00
9	Ohio University	25.00
19	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00
21	American Sports Publishing Co.:	
	Royalty on Football Rules	\$1,645.62
	Royalty on Swimming Rules	88.80
	Royalty on Track Rules	113.97
		1,848.39
26	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	2.56
	West Chester State Teachers College	25.00
28	Basketball Rules Committee	551.37
Feb. 19	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	11.70
28	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	5.96
Mar. 18	Southern Methodist University	25.00
19	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	7.00
25	University of Akron	25.00
Apr. 1	Loyola University	25.00
	Iowa State College	25.00
13	DePauw University	25.00
25	American Sports Publishing Co.:	
	Royalty on Soccer Rules	\$82.14
	Royalty on Ice Hockey Rules	72.66
	Royalty on Wrestling Rules	41.97
	Royalty on Swimming Rules	91.05
		287.82
May 10	Franklin and Marshall College	25.00
	Brown University	25.00
11	Yale University	25.00
13	Case School of Applied Science	25.00
	Johns Hopkins University	25.00
	Lafayette College	25.00
	University of Delaware	25.00
14	U. S. Naval Academy	25.00
	Georgetown University	25.00
	Union College	25.00
	Oberlin College	25.00
15	Western State Teachers College	25.00
	University of Maryland	25.00
16	Columbia University	25.00
	University of Rochester	25.00
	Clarkson College of Technology	25.00
	Dartmouth College	25.00
17	Colorado Agricultural College	25.00
	Dickinson College	25.00
	University of New Hampshire	25.00

18	Tulane University	25.00
	U. S. Military Academy	25.00
	University of Florida	50.00
	Temple University	25.00
	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Clemson Agricultural College	25.00
20	University of Chicago	25.00
	Hamilton College	25.00
	Wesleyan University	25.00
	University of Nebraska	25.00
	Rice Institute	25.00
21	Swarthmore College	25.00
22	Hobart College	25.00
	Denison University	25.00
	Colgate University	25.00
	Vanderbilt University	25.00
	Susquehanna University	25.00
23	Boston College	25.00
	Princeton University	25.00
	University of Notre Dame	25.00
	University of Virginia	25.00
	Mass. Institute of Technology	25.00
25	Cornell University	25.00
	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	3.10
	University of Texas	25.00
	University of Vermont	25.00
	State College of Washington	50.00
27	Bradley Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Stevens Institute of Technology	25.00
	Connecticut State College	25.00
	University of Tennessee	25.00
	University of Southern California	25.00
28	College of the City of New York	25.00
	New York University	25.00
29	University of Oregon	25.00
	Marquette University	25.00
30	Amherst College	25.00
June 1	University of Pennsylvania	25.00
3	Interest, Savings Bank	30.00
5	University of Minnesota	25.00
6	Trinity College	25.00
7	Massachusetts State College	25.00
	University of Cincinnati	25.00
8	Wooster College	25.00
11	Gettysburg College	25.00
	Washington and Lee University	25.00
14	Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	University of Pittsburgh	25.00
	Southwestern Athletic Conference	25.00
16	Manhattan College	25.00
17	Alfred University	25.00
19	Ohio Wesleyan University	25.00
26	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	1.00
July 2	University of Colorado	25.00
15	University of Nebraska	25.00
	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	2.80
Aug. 2	Villanova College	50.00
Sept. 13	Duquesne University	25.00
30	Drexel Institute	25.00
Oct. 10	U. S. Coast Guard Academy	25.00
	Bates College	25.00

	Harvard University	25.00
	Mercersburg Academy	10.00
11	Haverford College	25.00
12	Williams College	25.00
14	Rutgers University	25.00
	Bowdoin College	25.00
	Baylor University	25.00
	University of Detroit	25.00
	Knox College	25.00
15	Middlebury College	25.00
	University of Washington	25.00
	University of North Carolina	50.00
	Lawrenceville School	10.00
16	Lehigh University	25.00
	Loyola University	25.00
	University of Maryland	25.00
	Indiana University	25.00
17	Butler University	25.00
18	Allegheny College	25.00
	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	1.00
19	University of Michigan	25.00
21	International Y. M. C. A. College	25.00
	State University of Iowa	25.00
	University of Maine	25.00
23	St. Lawrence University	25.00
24	Howard University	25.00
25	Purdue University	25.00
26	University of Illinois	25.00
28	Tufts College	25.00
29	University of California	25.00
30	Carnegie Institute of Technology	25.00
31	Iowa State College	25.00
Nov. 2	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Coe College	25.00
4	Stanford University	25.00
	Texas A. and M. College	25.00
9	Boston University	25.00
	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Fordham University	25.00
11	Lawrence College	25.00
14	University of the South	25.00
	Clarkson College of Technology	25.00
	Catholic University of America	25.00
15	Pennsylvania Military College	25.00
	Kansas College Athletic Association	25.00
	Pennsylvania State College	25.00
18	Michigan State Normal College	25.00
	St. Louis University	25.00
19	Oregon State College	50.00
20	Creighton University	25.00
	Drake University	25.00
	Grinnell College	25.00
	Oklahoma A. and M. College	25.00
	Washington University	25.00
23	Georgia School of Technology	25.00
25	Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00
	Geneva College	25.00
	Andover Academy	10.00
27	Niagara University	25.00
29	University of Buffalo	25.00

Dec. 6	Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference	25.00
14	University of Kansas	25.00
17	Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00
21	Interest, Savings Banks	75.78
		<hr/> \$11,677.43

1934

CR.

Dec. 29	Pennsylvania Hotel, convention expenses	\$62.90
	F. W. Nicolson, convention expenses	28.75
1935		
Jan. 3	J. L. Griffith, convention expenses	79.60
7	R. L. Sackett, executive committee	25.88
11	Pelton and King, printing and postage	256.61
	Z. G. Clevenger, committee on recruiting	7.25
12	Wesleyan Store, postage	1.19
14	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegram	.89
17	A. W. Marsh, soccer committee	27.75
	D. Stewart, soccer committee	14.40
	H. W. Clark, soccer committee	27.75
21	Master Reporting Co., convention expenses	36.36
25	Whitehead and Hoag Co., convention expenses	31.15
26	Football Coaches Association, convention expenses	2.25
Feb. 2	Pelton and King, binding	2.50
4	Wesleyan Store, postage	3.00
12	Pelton and King, printing and postage	729.82
19	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegram	.78
26	Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing	6.90
Mar. 5	D. X. Bible, football rules committee	129.95
	R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee	4.15
15	F. W. Nicolson, expressage	.70
16	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegram	.63
	W. G. Crowell, football rules committee	25.52
	W. J. Bingham, football rules committee	61.37
	R. Morrison, football rules committee	128.17
	L. H. Mahony, football rules committee	161.87
17	Federal cheque tax	.10
18	J. L. Griffith, telegrams	6.00
	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.00
20	A. A. Stagg, football rules committee	226.19
25	Wesleyan Store, postage	.72
Apr. 13	E. Cowie, stenographic work	50.00
	W. S. Langford, football rules committee	80.97
	C. F. Foster, wrestling rules committee	24.02
	C. P. Miles, wrestling rules committee	57.83
	E. G. Schroeder, wrestling rules committee	115.42
	R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee	138.84
	D. B. Swingle, wrestling rules committee	165.19
	F. W. Luehring, swimming rules committee	40.88
15	Oswald Tower, basketball rules committee	34.00
16	J. A. Rockwell, wrestling rules committee	49.40
19	L. W. St. John, basketball rules committee	80.66
25	J. W. St. Clair, basketball rules committee	130.92
	J. F. Bohler, basketball rules committee	44.75
	H. G. Crisp, basketball rules committee	85.48
May 3	F. W. Nicolson, executive committee	10.00
	F. C. Allen, basketball rules committee	155.97
	A. E. Eilers, swimming rules committee	123.05
8	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.00
10	Harvard Club of New York, executive committee	23.16

		L. W. St. John, executive committee	58.16
	11	J. L. Griffith, executive committee	66.10
	22	Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing	1.00
	25	W. E. Meanwell, basketball rules committee	121.70
June	3	Hazen's Bookstore, record book65
	5	Pelton and King, printing and postage	40.34
	6	Joseph Stubbs, ice hockey rules committee	31.16
	13	J. E. Lowrey, ice hockey rules committee	26.25
		Yahnundasis Golf Club, ice hockey rules committee	33.75
	17	Lawson Robertson, track rules committee	99.01
		Clyde Littlefield, track rules committee	87.55
		F. W. Nicolson, secretary's allowance	500.00
	24	R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee	4.15
		B. E. Wiggins, wrestling rules committee	9.06
	25	Middletown National Bank, exchange12
	27	H. J. Huff, track rules committee	34.19
July	2	L. F. Keller, ice hockey rules committee	92.78
	3	C. M. Updegraff, committee on Federal tax	65.53
	10	Princeton University Press, athletic injuries hand- book	3.86
		H. W. Hughes, track rules committee	62.07
		R. A. Fetzer, track rules committee	75.60
	15	L. W. St. John, Olympic rules committee	10.00
Aug.	2	E. A. Thomas, track rules committee	41.10
Sept.	17	Wesleyan Store, postage	3.00
		R. L. Sackett, executive committee	25.13
	23	F. W. Nicolson, executive committee	10.00
	25	J. L. Griffith, executive committee	82.05
	26	R. L. Sackett, executive committee	30.76
	27	Harvard Club of New York, executive committee	23.36
Oct.	1	E. Cowie, stenographic work	50.00
	5	Wesleyan Store, postage	20.00
		G. T. Kirby, dues American Olympic Association	25.00
	10	G. T. Kirby, dues American Olympic Association	25.00
		F. R. Eastwood, committee on football fatalities	62.50
	14	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams	2.30
Nov.	6	Pelton and King, printing and postage	88.12
	7	G. T. Kirby, dues American Olympic Association	500.00
	26	Middletown National Bank, exchange10
	29	W. E. Meanwell, basketball rules committee	89.20
Dec.	5	W. R. Okeson, football rules committee	25.50
	6	H. J. Stegeman, football rules committee	86.13
	12	Middletown National Bank, exchange10
	14	Sportsmanship Brotherhood, dues	10.00
	16	Hotel Sherman, Chicago, football rules committee	7.06
	28	Amount carried forward	5,538.35
			\$11,677.43

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COL- LEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 27-29, 1936

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Association - - - - -	2
Rules Committees for 1937 - - - - -	3
Roll of Members - - - - -	6
Delegates and Visitors present - - - - -	14
Proceedings of Convention of 1936 - - - - -	17
Reports of Districts - - - - -	21
Reports of Rules Committees:	
Association Football (Soccer) - - - - -	39
Basketball - - - - -	40
Boxing - - - - -	41
Fencing - - - - -	43
Football - - - - -	44
Gymnastics - - - - -	48
Ice Hockey - - - - -	49
Swimming - - - - -	51
Track and Field - - - - -	55
Wrestling - - - - -	58
Reports of Special Committees:	
Radio Broadcasting of College Games - - - - -	63
Influences inimical to best Interests of College Sport - - - - -	72
Eligibility for N. C. A. A. Meets - - - - -	76
Federal Admissions Tax - - - - -	79
Addresses at the Convention:	
Presidential Address—John L. Griffith - - - - -	82
President R. C. Hutchison - - - - -	90
President J. L. McConaughy - - - - -	98
President Thurston J. Davies - - - - -	106
Appendix I.—Reports of Round Table Conferences - - - - -	113
Appendix II.—Report of Treasurer for 1936 - - - - -	153